

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER 1839.

---

No. IV.

---

---

ART. I.—1. *The Intermediate State: a Sermon by the Rev. Reuben Sherwood of Hyde Park.* New York, pp. 18. Appendix, pp. 42.

2. *No Intermediate Place: a Sermon delivered in the Reformed Dutch Church in Hyde Park, by the Rev. William Cruikshanks,* pp. 22.

THE discourse of Mr. Cruikshanks is a brief, plain, straightforward, honest and manly illustration of the doctrine of an intermediate *state* of departed souls; with a refutation of the doctrine of an intermediate *place* of the dead. Mr. C. goes forth into the field to meet a challenge; and he goes with his sling and the smooth stones of the brook, although he is not a Goliath that he has to encounter. He goes forth with his Bible, and tells us what God's word has declared in reference to the state of departed souls.

That there is no intermediate *place*, he argues from the plain statements of the holy Scriptures; from the fact that it is contrary to all the desires and expectations of the people of God; that it is contrary to their approved faith; that it is in direct opposition to the case stated by our Lord, in his parable of Dives and Lazarus; and to the holy visions of the

saints in heaven, as seen by the apostle John. And he closes by reviewing the leading objections lately offered to this doctrine of the church of Christ, and making a touching appeal to the hearts of his audience.

The discourse of Mr. Sherwood we shall not attempt to criticise in detail. It sets criticism at defiance. No man of taste can endure the vulgarity of his style. Besides, Mr. S. has yet to study the theology of the best fathers of his own church; and in a special manner the subject which he has undertaken to discuss. He hastens to teach others, before he has himself studied the topic of discussion. He hurries into his subject without definitions or explanations. Hence he sails, the whole of his voyage, under false colours. He styles his discourse, "*The Intermediate State.*" Now, no one belonging to the Reformed Churches, questions the fact of an intermediate *state*. But, under this erroneous title, and thence by erroneous arguments, does he actually labour, all the while, to establish the doctrine of An Intermediate PLACE!

His main argument, and we venture to call it the *πρωτον ψευδος* of his theory, is this: "There is a general judgment at the last day, when the saints are made perfect in holiness and happiness. This he fortifies with much vigour and anxiety, as if his Christian opponents really doubted it. Thence he draws the profound inferences, that, *therefore*, there is no particular judgment at their death; *therefore*, the believer does not depart *in holiness* at death; and, *therefore*, not one soul enters heaven until the final day of judgment; because they are all made perfect in holiness and perfect in happiness only at the last day! This single assumption is pressed in to sustain his whole theory. Hence he gravely collects many passages of holy writ, and many scraps of wisdom from the fathers of the church, to prove, irrefragably, what no sober man ever denied; namely, that the saints are really, and truly, and most certainly made perfect in happiness and glory at the last day.\* Hence, feeling the laurels of victory already on his head, he shouts victory in simply drawing the eventful inference,—that, therefore,

\* In his various quotations, we perceive that whenever he finds an author, or the creed of a Church admitting that the saints are made perfect in happiness and complete in glory *at the last day*,—these he is sure to press in to his support. Hence he quotes even the Confession of the Reformed Dutch Church. Sherw. Disc. Append. p. 51. 54. And he can also discover his doctrine in the Westminster Confession! Append. p. 59.



there is no particular judgment or decision at the believer's death; that no one is made perfect in holiness at death; and that no one enters into *any degree* of glory in heaven at death, for the most manifest reason, that they enter into *perfect* glory and happiness in heaven at the last day." This is the amount of the puerile and unanswerable logic of the Reverend Rector of St. James, at Hyde Park!

Having by this unique and matchless logic, more "mysterious than Geneva logic," dislodged the saints from heaven; and having brought quotations from the creed of the Reformed Dutch Church, the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches, and from ancient and modern fathers, as witnesses, all uttering as he supposes the same sentence of exclusion against the saints, he proceeds to lay down his theory. And it cannot boast of originality in his hands. It is a meagre gleanings from the pages of bishops Seabury and Hobart. It is this:—*First*, The souls of believers are *not* made perfect in holiness at death. *Second*, They are not received immediately into heaven, in happiness and glory. As they depart *not* in perfect holiness, they depart, of course, in their sins still cleaving to them. And they go "into the lower parts of the earth;"—"into a place out of heaven," and "apart from heaven;" they "are in the prison, whither *Christ went and preached to the spirits in prison*;"\* and that place and prison is "not heaven, but paradise." Sherwood's Disc. pp. 6, 7, 13, &c.

In the history of the theological opinions respecting the state of departed souls, we discover a great variety. And many of them diverge widely from the plain and explicit doctrine of the Holy Scriptures on this point. The Spirit of God has declared that the Old Testament saints died in the faith of Christ; that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were in the kingdom of heaven, in the days of our Lord, and before his death and descent into the invisible world. Math. viii. 11, that the righteous entered into peace; and while their bodies "rested in their beds," of the grave, "each one of them was walking in his uprightness." Isaiah lvii. 1, 2, that "*the dead do all live to God*;" and, finally, that the departed saints are "the spirits of just men made perfect," Luke xx. 37, 38. Heb. xii. 23. Such was the doctrine of the ancient church of God.

\* Thus our Rector actually avows his faith in the Popish Limbus of the Fathers.

Those nations who were not within the pale of the visible church, but had gone "forth from the presence of the Lord," soon lost the very tradition of this primitive doctrine. This is evident from the remaining writings and fragments of the most ancient classic writers; and of those that are less ancient. And from the time when the Hebrews mingled with heathen during the seventy years captivity; and, especially, after their doctors had been gradually corrupted by the theories of the Greek philosophers under the Grecian empire, and, finally, under the Roman empire, their sentiments on this point began to differ more and more widely from the doctrines of their sacred writings, and the faith of their fore-fathers. They seem to have adopted the fictions of their conquerors on this point. They conceived that departed souls are placed in different local habitations, or *places*, adapted to their characters. Many of them evidently adopted the doctrine of the transmigration of souls into other bodies. Hence that question put by the Jews,—“Who sinned; this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?” Hence their opinions about our Lord, that he was Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the old prophets in another form and body! Hence that remarkable expression in the book of Wisdom, written by a Jew, who had been corrupted by the philosophy of Pythagoras,—“I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea, rather, being good, *I came into a body undefiled.*”\*

Others supposed, with the Platonists, that the soul, having departed from the material and gross body, went into a *place* called by the heathen writers, the Elysian fields; but by the Jewish doctors,—“the habitations and places adapted to the pure soul:” that it there had an ethereal, or aeriform body; but that it never was again to be re-united to the body by a resurrection. These Pharisees did, indeed, use the word *ἀνασσις*, which is usually rendered “resurrection.” But, as Dr. Campbell has proved by a quotation out of Josephus, all that even the Pharisees intended by the *ἀνασσις τῶν νεκρῶν*, was simply the existence of the soul in a future state; and the transmigration of the soul into other bodies.†

As the Platonic doctrine gained ground in the primitive Christian ages, this sentiment of course gained ground, that the immortal soul, in order to its being perfectly happy in Elysium, must be stript of its gross material body. St. Au-

\* See John ix. 2. Wisdom viii. 19, 20. Campb. Dissert. VI. Part II.

† See Campb. Diss. VI. Part II. Sect. 19. Josephus, Antiq. Book 18, ch. 2, &c.



gustine inveighed with vehemence against this Platonic innovation, as a doctrine clearly militating against the divine doctrine of the resurrection of the body from the dead.\* These denunciations fell with justice on those "*Christian fathers*," the Platonic philosophers, who had embraced Christianity in appearance; but who, in reality, had not put off Plato, nor the old man; but had put the mask of Christianity over them. Plato, and his genuine followers, admitted that the departed soul had a body; but not a material body. That body, once sunk into the grave, was never to be recalled from the dust. The bodies in which they clothed the happy souls in Elysium were, as we have seen, aeriform, or etherial bodies.

The platonizing Christian adopted this theory, without admitting those aeriform bodies. This, so far as we can discover, was their theory;—The souls of believers, at death, departed into perfect happiness, and received their full reward: the soul needed no body to make it happy: matter would only impede its happiness and glory. Hence there was no resurrection of the dead. This was the "*ancient heresy*" which distracted the early Christian church; to which Mr. Sherwood has alluded; and which, through inexcusable ignorance of church history, he has actually charged upon us as our doctrine! (Disc. p. 7.)

To counteract this ancient and dangerous error, one class of the early fathers who entered the lists against "the platonizing Christians," maintained that the souls of believers after death remained in a state of insensibility, and deep slumber, until they received their bodies back again from the grave. For they fell directly into the opposite extreme. They taught that the soul could not enjoy happiness and glory **WITHOUT THE BODY!**

Another class of these opponents flattered themselves that they could more effectually resist these Platonic errorists, by assuming a middle position. They did not go quite so far as the other opponents. They held that the departed souls did indeed retain the power of acting, and of knowing, and delighting in God. But, still, until the re-union of the soul to the body, they were not perfect in any thing. They did indeed allow them some sensations, some capacity of enjoyment: but they were not received into heaven: they were retained in a PLACE apart from heaven, and they did not allow

\* De Civit. Dei. Lib. 13. Cap. 16.

them to enter heaven till they received their bodies back again from the grave.

There is nothing new under the sun, not even in the wild vagaries of theologians. The *first* of these sects was revived in the persons of certain speculators at the time of the Reformation; whom the pious divines who drew up the earliest Scottish Confession of Faith, in A. D. 1560, did impressively call "certain fanatics" (fanatics), "who affirm that the departed souls do sleep, and come to a certain oblivion." At a later period this theory was revived by Parker in his book "De Descensu," Lib. ii. p. 77.—The venerable John Howe has, in a brief manner, shown up this theory, as contrary to reason, philosophy, and Scripture.\*

At a still later period, this theory was revived by Dr. Law, late bishop of Carlisle. He has been refuted by Dr. Campbell.†

On the other hand, the theory of the *second* class of these sects, has also been revived by several writers of the high church party in England and in our country. They profess to believe in "an intermediate PLACE." "It is not heaven:" "it is apart from heaven:" "it is not the kingdom of glory:" "it is in the lower parts of the earth:" "it is the prison of soul, *into which Christ descended and preached to the spirits there:*" it is the bosom of Abraham, and paradise"—"apart from the mansions of glory."‡

In opposition to these various theories, the doctrine of the purest of the early fathers, and that which is expressed in the confessions, canons, and articles of the different sections of the Reformed Churches, is this:—First, The souls of believers are at their death, made perfect in holiness. Second, They are judged at death, and admitted immediately into glory in heaven or paradise, where Christ is, there to enjoy true and eternal glory. This is THE INTERMEDIATE STATE of departed souls. There is, we believe, NO INTERMEDIATE PLACE. And at the last day, the souls of believers having again received their bodies raised out of the grave, do after the general judgment, receive their complete reward in PERFECT glory and PERFECT happiness.

We are now prepared, I. To review the arguments advanced by the high church party in defence of their theory.

\* Howe's Works, Haven's N. York Edit. p. 222. Note R.

† Dissert. VI. Part ii. Sect. 23.

‡ Seabury's Sermons; Hobart, &c. &c.



II. We shall review the evidence by which the doctrine of the holy Bible on this point is fully sustained.

I. The doctrine of AN INTERMEDIATE PLACE.—In the *first* place, the advocates have eulogized this doctrine as “most reasonable and scriptural,” and as “*most comfortable, and glorious doctrine.*” We shall see presently whether it has any claims to be “reasonable and scriptural.” For its attributes of “comfort and glory,” it seems to us rather surprising that they should have been claimed for it. “Comfortable and glorious” to depart *not* perfect in holiness; and, therefore, with sin and corruption lingering in them! “Comfortable and glorious” to be excluded from heaven for untold ages! “Comfortable and glorious” not to be in glory with Christ until the last day! “Comfortable and glorious” to be in a place “away from heaven.” and “in the lowest parts of the earth!” “Comfortable and glorious” to be away from Christ’s presence, exiled from heaven, and shut up in the prison of Spirits until the last day!—Surely the reason of the humblest Sabbath School pupil would promptly pronounce it unspeakably more “comfortable and glorious” to be made perfect in holiness at death, and to enter immediately into true happiness and eternal glory, with Christ in heaven!

*Second.* The advocates of this doctrine involve themselves in ambiguity and confusion at every step. They profess to advocate the doctrine of “an intermediate PLACE.” Their proofs go to show merely the truth of an “intermediate STATE.” This error pervades their every argument. They lose sight, some how or other, of our doctrine entirely: namely, that the souls of believers at death, enter in a perfect state of holiness, into a *high* degree of happiness, and eternal glory, in heaven. And at the last day they reach the utmost perfection of felicity, and glory everlasting. They labour to represent us as teaching that the saints at death are completely perfect not only in *holiness*, but also in *happiness and glory!* And having by this manoeuvre, contrived to identify us with the platonizing fathers, they charge us with the guilt of adhering to an “ancient heresy.” (Sherwood, p. 7.)

Having thus put themselves in a wrong position, they have fallen and floundered into an argument befitting this false position. Their argument substantially is this, as we have already hinted:—At the *general* judgment, the saints are made perfect in holiness and happiness and glory: hence there is no *particular* judgment at death: hence souls are not in heaven, and will not be there, until they receive their bodies

from the grave, and enter on full perfection in glory after the last day. Every text which they quote, say they, goes to establish these positions: namely, that we are not made *perfect* in happiness and glory until the last day. Hence there *is* an intermediate STATE: and because there is such a state, therefore we have proved that there is an intermediate PLACE. For such is their inference! The evidence of an intermediate *state*, establishes an intermediate PLACE! And because no soul is perfectly happy until the last day: therefore no one has happiness in heaven in any degree whatever! Therefore no souls are in heaven: therefore they are somewhere else, and that is paradise, or the intermediate place! Such is the logic of the high church party on this point.

By this mode of reasoning, they might, with equal success, prove that because there is a *general* providence, there can be no *particular* providence! And because the son and heir of a kingdom does not reach the full honours, and the complete enjoyment of his estate, until he is fully of age; therefore, he is not admitted to his father's table, nor even allowed to appear in his father's house, during the "intermediate state" of his non-age!

*Third.* By way of *argumentum ad invidiam*, our opponents charge it to the guilt of our doctrine that it is, primarily, popish. Mr. Sherwood, following in the steps of his masters, even ventures to tell the public that the Church of Rome was the *first* to declare this doctrine authoritatively, that the souls of believers enter immediately into glory. (pp. 56, 57.) It will be enough, in order to set him, right simply to quote the Romish doctrine, as established by the council of Florence. "Tria esse loca, &c. There are three places of the departed souls: those of the saints are in heaven: those of the wicked are in hell: those who died under *venial* sins, are in purgatory."\* Now, as the latest high church writer on this point, maintains that the souls of believers depart *not* perfect in holiness, and of course with sin and depravity still adhering to them, he must mean the sin adhering to the believer,—not the *mortal* sin of the impenitent. He must mean then, *venial* sins. And if they thus depart in sin, this sin must either be expurgated in the other world; or, as the necessary result,—it must "wax worse and worse." Here, then, we have our author putting souls, with their sins,

\* Labbeus, Concil. Tom. XVIII. p. 26. Also Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 452, London new edition.



“into a prison,” in “the lower parts of the earth!” If this be not purgatory, nothing has ever yet existed so precisely like it! And that things so very similar will approximate, by the law of their nature, until they shall become completely one, we have the following evidence in an extract from the Oxford Tracts, by Dr. Pusey. It will be seen that the only difference between our high churchmen, and the Oxford divines, and the Dublin Doctor Todd, is simply this,—the latter have got considerably the start of the former. They have been both on the same descent; and are both in full career of descent to find their level. Let us hear Dr. Pusey:—“Prayer for departed saints—since knowing them to be in a state” (place?) “of imperfect bliss, until the resurrection, whenever we pray for the final coming of God’s kingdom, we do, in fact (if we have any thought for the departed), *pray at the same time, for the perfecting of their bliss.*”<sup>\*</sup> Hence there is scarcely even a degree of visibility between this high church doctrine, and the more ancient fiction of purgatory!

*Fourth.* They appeal to the primitive Christian fathers in favour of their novel doctrine. Now, no sober and discreet man, who is even very partially acquainted with these fathers, would venture such an appeal. I shall select a few specimens of the opinions of the best of them. St. Augustine says,—“We own a heaven and a hell; besides these we know of no middle place. *Tertium locum penitus ignoramus, &c.*”<sup>†</sup> Ephraim teaches,—“that to escape hell, is to enter into the kingdom of heaven: to fail of heaven is to be plunged into hell.”<sup>‡</sup> Ignatius, in his epistle to the Magnesians, speaks of “future happiness and misery:”—“a state of life, and a state of death,” without the slightest allusion to a “middle place.” Polycarp wrote on the resurrection; and Athenagoras, the Athenian philosopher, composed a treatise on the same subject. Yet neither of them allude either to a purgatory or a middle place.<sup>§</sup> Cyril, of Alexandria, in the Homily *De Exitu Animi*, thus writes:—“Οἱ δίκαιοι εἰς παράδεισον κ. τ. λ. The righteous depart to paradise; the impenitent into unquenchable fire: the righteous into heaven; the wicked into hell: the righteous into the hand of God; the wicked into the hands of the devil.”<sup>||</sup> And, finally, the

\* Dr. Pusey’s Answer in Defence of Tracts 75 and 78.

† Tom. X. p. 40.

‡ Opera, pp. 19, 20.

§ See Edgar’s Variations, p. 469.

|| Cyril. Alex. Opera, Tom. V. Pars 2. p. 410. Bern. De Moor IV. p. 153.

other fathers who taught a "middle place," did all of them teach that that place was a place of purgation from sins. This opinion was introduced by them from pagan writers. And in course of time it originated the monstrous fiction of purgatory. Even the best of these fathers, such as St. Augustine and Ambrose, prayed for *the dead who were in heaven!* Thus the first of these prayed for the soul of his mother Monica, who, being an eminent Christian, was undoubtedly in heaven.\* Nay, what seems almost incredible, such fathers as Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine, did not only pray for the saints in heaven, they even prayed for the doomed in hell. To use the words of Augustine,—*"Ut tolerabilior, &c. that their torments might come to an end."*† So monstrously have these fathers' works been corrupted; or, so monstrously corrupted were their own doctrinal opinions!

*Fifth.* The advocates of this novel doctrine of the intermediate PLACE appeal to certain texts of the Holy Scriptures. Their exposition of these texts we shall now review.

1st. They press in Heb. xi. 39, 40. These (Old Testament saints) all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us that they without us should not be perfect." Here, say they, by "the promise" is meant heaven; hence the Old Testament saints have not yet received heaven! The error, here, lies in assuming, without proof, that by "promise" is meant heaven. But it will be quite obvious to those who critically examine the use of the word in the Sacred Scriptures, that it means that glorious promise—"THE PROMISE," by way of eminence and superiority over all other promises; that which was given to our fallen and ruined race in the garden; namely, the promise of Messiah, who was to come in the flesh. This was THE PROMISE given to the fathers. On this promise all other blessings were suspended. To take it in any other sense, violates the apostle's argument. His aim in this epistle is to convince the Hebrews that Jesus Christ is the Messiah promised to the fathers. Now he assumes that these saints are in heaven; and that it was by the faith of the coming of the Messiah that they were in glory. This is the *first* fact which he establishes. The *second* is this:—the unspeakable superiority of the New Testament dispensation to that of the Old. All our fathers, said he, died without having re-

\* See Aug. Confes. IX. cap. 13. p. 173. Ambros. Tom. V. pp. 114, 121.

† Aug. Oper. VII. pp. 238, 239.



ceived the fulfillment of the illustrious promise of the incarnate Messiah. They lived not to see him in the flesh. But, we have received the promise. We have seen and welcomed "God manifest in the flesh." They of old, have only the promise uttered to their faith. We have its fulfillment demonstrated before our eyes. And this new dispensation of grace is "that better thing" which we have. Their dispensation was one of types, figures, and shadows. Ours is that of the visible reality of the substance. They without us were not perfect. Theirs was the incipient dispensation. Ours is the consummated one.—This is the substance of the apostle's argument to convince and win over the Hebrews. What a repulsive argument would our opponents make out of this,—by making the apostle assure the Hebrews that not one of all their eminent patriarchs had yet reached heaven!

And even admitting their interpretation of "the promise," it can be referred only to the case of the Old Testament saints alone. For the apostle expressly names them, and limits his reference to them. Their conclusion then, were it even legitimate, cannot affect the certainty of the souls of New Testament believers entering immediately into heaven at death. So, then, even at the best, this lame and halting exposition, is nothing less nor more than the revival of the old popish doctrine of "THE LIMBUS OF THE FATHERS." That is to say, the imprisonment of the Old Testament saints in "the prison" of Limbus, until Christ, as they suppose, went down and preached to the spirits in prison, and brought them all up with him when he went, in his soul, to paradise!

But there is another strong point which fully establishes our exposition of this passage. It is this. To refer "the promise" to the soul's enjoyment of heaven; and, thence, to infer that the souls of the Old Testament saints, and also all other saints since their time, in their "not obtaining the promise," did not enter into heaven at death,—does actually place the apostle in direct contradiction to himself. In Hebrews vi. 12, he explicitly declared that departed saints, through faith and patience, do inherit the promises. In verse 15, he declares the same thing of Abraham, who had "obtained the promise." And this was true in reference to the temporal blessings promised: the multiplication of his family; the certainty of the descent of the Messiah from him; and, lastly, the grand end, and all absorbing aim of his faith in that Messiah, his introduction into the kingdom of heaven at death.

And, if possible, to make assurance doubly sure, the apostle rehearses the condition of departed saints as "the spirits of just men made perfect," with whom the church on earth is brought into a joyful and glorious communion. Heb. xii. 23.

2d. They press in John iii. 13, to prop their theory: "*No man hath ascended up to heaven* but he that came down from heaven; even the son of man who is in heaven." This is entirely foreign from the point. It has not the remotest reference to the state of departed souls. It is a passage similar to that of Rom. x. 6, "Say not in thy heart, who shall ascend into heaven; that is, to bring Christ down?" So, our Lord, in the above text, says, "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" "And no man hath ascended into heaven,"—that is, no created being can ascend into heaven, in order to discover the infinite mind of God. No one can do this, but HE who came down from heaven; even the Son of Man who is in heaven." This text, therefore, is injured by their false exposition.

3d. They lay much stress on that divine sentence in John xiv. 2, 3, "In my Father's house are many mansions: I go to prepare a place for you;—and *I will come again* to receive you to myself: that where I am, there may ye be also."—Here, say they, it is manifest that no departed soul is in heaven, nor will be in heaven, until Christ *comes again* to receive them to himself. But Christ does not come again to receive them until the last day. Hence, no departed soul is in heaven now, nor will be, until after the general judgment.

This sophistry is founded on the assumption that there is only ONE "coming of Christ again." Now we humbly conceive that no one well acquainted with his Bible could have fallen into this error. There are certain "comings of Christ our Lord," which cannot be referred to the last day only. *First*:—God our sovereign "COMETH forth," when he inflicts severe judgments on men. See Isaiah lxiii. 1, and Micah i. 3. *Second*:—Our Lord COMES to a people, when he sends the gospel to them. Math. xvi. 28, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." See also Ephes. ii. 15, 16. This coming of our Lord can by no rules of criticism be referred to his final coming at the last day.



*Third:*—Christ comes to each one of us, personally, at death. Math. xxiv. 44, and xxv. 12, “Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not of, the Son of Man cometh.” This cannot be referred to his coming at the last day. If so, then it is assumed that each one of us shall live on the earth until the Great God shall appear at the last judgment! *Fourth:*—There is a second coming of Christ, in his human nature, at the last day, as the Judge of all the quick and dead. “Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him.” Rev. i. 7.

This coming of Christ, alluded to in John xiv. 2, 3, has a double application. He comes at death to receive each of us *personally* into heaven. He comes at the last day to receive us *collectively*, as his CHURCH, into his mansions of glory. Their theory, therefore, derives no aid from this text.

4th. Another text on which they lay violent hands, is Acts ii. 34, “David is *not* yet ascended into the heavens.” Can any thing be plainer? David is not in heaven. And if such a saint be not in heaven, then, verily, no other saint is in heaven! Hence there is not a saint in heaven yet!! Therefore there is an intermediate PLACE.

This text, as is evident from the context, refers manifestly to the resurrection of the body, and not to the state, or place of David’s soul. The apostle is demonstrating to his audience the fact of Christ’s resurrection. To effect this, he quotes Psalm xvi. 10, 11, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,”—that is, in SHEOL, in Hades, in the invisible world: that is, in a state of separation from my body: “neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.” From this passage he reasons thus:—This account of the resurrection cannot be referred to David himself. For he is dead and buried; and his sepulchre is with us. He is, therefore, not received into the heavens, as this Holy One is here distinctly said to be. Hence, it is not of David’s dead body, that he speaks in this place; but of Messiah’s dead body. Hence our Lord said to Mary,—“Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my God, and your God.” His pure and holy soul had, indeed, been received by his Father, in heaven, in his “intermediate state;” but he had not yet ascended to heaven in his complete human nature. This took place at his ascent from Mount Olivet.

Such is the amount of their argument; and a specimen of their mode of conducting it. We shall now invite attention

to the arguments on behalf of THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, in opposition to this novel and ill-sustained fiction of AN INTERMEDIATE PLACE.

We beg attention to two distinct heads of discussion.—  
**FIRST:** That the souls of believers are, at their death, MADE PERFECT IN HOLINESS. **SECOND:** That the souls of believers do, at their death, PASS IMMEDIATELY INTO GLORY ETERNAL, AND A HIGH DEGREE OF HAPPINESS.

**FIRST: THEY ARE MADE PERFECT IN HOLINESS AT DEATH.**  
 —This is the doctrine of the Church of Christ, professed by all the branches of the Reformed Church. The following quotations will show this. In the shorter catechism of the Westminster Assembly, which forms a part of the creed of all the branches of the Presbyterian Churches, at home and abroad, this doctrine is expressed:—"The souls of believers are, at their death, MADE PERFECT IN HOLINESS." Quest. 37. In the Heidelberg catechism, which is a part of the creed of the Reformed Dutch Church, it is thus taught:—"Our death is not a satisfaction for sin, but only AN ABOLISHING OF SIN." "After this life, I shall inherit perfect salvation. Quest. 42, 58. With the R. D. Church agree the Reformed churches of France, Switzerland, Holland, and the Reformed German Church in Germany, and in the United States, which adopt this as their catechism. In the Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church the same doctrine is taught, by implication, in the Communion Service, and directly in the following passage in the Burial of the Dead. "O Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord: and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." Thus, departed saints are delivered from the burden of that "flesh and blood" which cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. This is the sense in which the apostle Paul uses the word "FLESH," in describing the corruption of our nature.\* If the advocates of the intermediate place insist that by "flesh," in this passage, is meant the "*flesh*" literally, that is, the body, how can they reconcile the whole of this passage with their own doctrine, that the soul is not admitted into heaven "to live with the Lord," until it be reunited to the flesh at the last day? The "flesh" here intended is that which must be "cast off" utter-

\* Rom. viii. 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, &c.



ly in order to our "dwelling with God in joy and felicity." We must be "*delivered from it.*" Now, assuredly, this is not the language used to describe the departure of the soul from the body at death. It appropriately describes our escape from a loathsome enemy in us, which is extripated on our departure from the body. And we suspect strongly that this is the meaning of the passage in the opinion of all high churchmen; for they take special care not to quote *the whole* of this passage, in their arguments, offensive and defensive, on the novel doctrine of "the intermediate place."

Lastly: This is the doctrine of the holy Scriptures. "The righteous is taken away from the evil *to come*," &c. "Isaiah lvii. 1. Here are two points of evidence: 1st. They "enter into peace:" that is "the peace of God," after death. Hence all their sin must be taken away. For there is no peace after death where sin is. That is, the righteous depart in a state of perfect holiness. 2d. "They are taken away from the evil." Let it be remarked that the words "*to come*," are not in the Hebrew. They are "taken away from the evil:" that is, the evil of sin, and the evil of suffering. Can any other class of evil be intended?

In the glorious vision on the mount of Transfiguration, "Moses and Elias appeared in glory." Now our opponents teach that there is no perfection in holiness, in other words, no degree of eternal glory in heaven bestowed on saints until the day of final judgment. But here Elijah appears in his glorified body and soul. And here is Moses, not in his body, but in his glorified soul, appearing "in glory," as well as Elijah. Being in glory, they must of course be perfectly free of all sin.

The apostle in detailing the spiritual privileges of the saints of the New Testament times, enumerates, among other blessings, their close communion with heaven. "We are come to the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to God the judge of all, to THE SPIRITS OF JUST MEN MADE PERFECT," &c. Since then, the spirits of the just are made perfect by God, they must be entirely free from sin.

And, finally, John, in the visions of their glory, beheld the souls of the departed saints "clothed in white robes;" "washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb;"—"in their mouth was found *no guile*; for they are *without fault before the throne of God*" This was their condition in the days of John; and such, therefore, is their state previous to the last day. See Rev. vi. 9, 10. vii. 13—17. xiv. 2—5.

SECOND: The souls of believers enter immediately after their death, into heaven, or paradise, to enjoy eternal glory, and a high degree of happiness.

Here it would be easy to parade quotations from the ancient Greek and Latin fathers. But we have, by the specimens already given, made our escape from this necessity. Gravely speaking, we think we could undertake to prove any doctrine from the fathers; and then, from the same fathers, prove directly the reverse of it! This state of their writings seems to be produced by two causes. 1st. Their works have been corrupted by the monks of the dark ages: and many additions foisted into them.\* 2d. These writings exhibit the gradual approach of those fathers from error to truth: and from truth again into error. They are a kind of a barometer, to mark the risings and depressions of their minds. They are a diary, in short, in which they enter their progress in opinions; their speculation, and faith, from their youth to intellectual manhood; from the manhood of the mind, to their dotage. We have a striking instance of this in the two huge folios of the father of the Friends, William Penn. In the beginning of his 1700 pages folio, he is at first nothing; he gradually seems somewhat *Calvinish*: then he is Arminian; anon, he is Pelagian; then Arian; then Sabellian. In the same manner on the pages of the glorious Luther. On his early pages he is a papist, and adores the Pope. Then, year after year, and through page after page, his giant mind forces its way by the word and spirit of God into the commanding position of a pure, whole-souled, disinterested Reformer. We shall, therefore, make no farther appeal to the fathers on this point. Although it would be no difficult matter to produce the best of them, in our favour.

The doctrine we advocate has ever been the doctrine of the church of God. We rejoice that we can carry off bishop Bull from the camp of the enemy's hosts.† Let us hear him. "I do affirm the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive church to be this:—that the souls of all the faithful, immediately after death, enter into a place and state of bliss, far exceeding all the felicities of this world; though short of that most consummate, perfect beatitude of heaven, with which they are to be crowned and rewarded in the resurrection.

\* See Erasmus' preface to his splendid edition of St. Augustine's works, dedicated to a Spanish Prelate.

† Unless like the Greek and Latin Fathers, he wants the unanimous consent with his own self, in his own writings.



And so, on the contrary, that the souls of all the wicked are, presently after death, in a state of very great misery; and yet dreading a far greater misery at the day of judgment.”\*

In consistency with this enlightened declaration, the Presbyterian Churches of the United States, Canada, Great Britain and Ireland, who adhere to the Westminster confession and catechisms, profess this doctrine, which Bishop Bull pronounces to have been “the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive church.” A single extract will be sufficient. “The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory.” Catechism, Quest. 37.

The Reformed Dutch Church in the United States and in Holland; the Reformed Churches of France, Switzerland, Germany, and in the United States, do utter their voice strongly and decisively on this point. “After this life, we reign with Christ eternally over all creatures.” “Death is an abolishing of sin, and A PASSAGE INTO ETERNAL LIFE.” “My soul, after this life, shall be IMMEDIATELY taken up to Christ its head.” “After this life, I shall inherit perfect salvation.” *Heidel. Catechism, Quest. 32, 42, 57, 58.*† The doctrine which follows this statement, is in precise accordance with the statement of the learned Dr. Bull; namely,—At the resurrection of the body, we shall enter upon our perfect happiness and eternal glory in our souls and bodies, in the church triumphant.

The Protestant Episcopal Church also utters her voice we think very distinctly against the opinion of the high church party in her. We shall select the following from the beautiful and solemn service of the Dead:—“I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, write, from henceforth blessed are the dead, &c.” This quotation seems to be taken out of the old version of the scriptures, in use before our present translation was made.‡ And the position of the word “henceforth,” as it stands in this clause of the Burial of the Dead, makes it, if possible, even stronger in our favour. “Write, blessed from henceforth are the dead.” That is, if there be any meaning in plain language, the departed souls of the

\* Bp. Bull’s Sermon on THE MIDDLE STATE.

† Yet Mr. Sherwood quotes the standards of the Dutch Church as one with his fiction of an Intermediate Place! *Disc. pp. 51, 54.*

‡ In the present version it runs thus:—“Write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth, &c.”

saints are in heaven's blessedness from the very instant of their decease. We shall give another extract even stronger, if possible, than this, in order to do justice to the genuine doctrine of the Episcopal Church, in opposition to the innovations of the high church party within her. We allude to the prayer in the same service:—"Almighty God, with whom DO LIVE the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord; and WITH WHOM the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity, &c." The prayer closes with the hope "of the perfect consummation and bliss, in body and soul," at the last day. The Episcopal Church is, therefore, decisively and perfectly at one on this point with all her sister churches. There is another sentence in the closing prayer to the same effect: and we quote it in order to point out an instance of unfair dealing in a late sermon writer on this subject. It is this:—"We humbly beseech thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, that when we shall depart this life, we may rest in him, AND that at the general resurrection, &c." Hence, the consummation of the last day is exhibited as coming in due time, after the soul shall have been long in heaven. But Mr. Sherwood, p. 14, puts the word "*but*" instead of "*and*" in order very probably to help the sentence to utter a tone in favour of his theory.

We shall now notice the sentiments of conspicuous modern divines in order to vindicate them from the imputation thrown on them by our opponents, that they believed in the *Intermediate Place*. And we shall accept of the quotations of these theologians as given by Hobart, Sherwood, &c. and thank them for helping our cause. Parkhurst says,\*—"Paradise is, in the New Testament, applied to the STATE of faithful souls between death and the resurrection—where they are admitted to immediate communion with God in Christ, &c." Doddridge is not quite decisive on either side. Yet we accept of this quotation,—“Thou shall be with me in paradise, the abode of happy saints when separate from the body.” Dr. Watts also makes paradise a STATE, not a *place*, in which saints are happy.† Dr. Adam Clark, on 2 Cor. xii. 7, calls it “the *place* of the blessed, or the *state* of departed spirits.”

Dr. Dwight held the doctrine which we advocate. Yet Mr. Sherwood ventures to press him into his service, in the fol-

\* Greek Lexicon, vox. Parad.

† Ess. on Separ. State, Sect. 3.



lowing form of quotation. "There can, I apprehend, be no reasonable doubt concerning an intermediate STATE." Now, in the first instance, this is nothing to *his* purpose. For Mr. S. advocates an intermediate *place*. In the next instance, it is a garbled and unfair quotation given by Mr. S. The whole sentence,—“Whatever may be true concerning an intermediate *place*, there can, I apprehend, be no reasonable doubt concerning an intermediate STATE.”\* This is precisely our doctrine.

Dr. Campbell is also pressed in by the high church opposition. But he is on our side *so far as he is consistent with himself*. Here are his words:—"There is in a lower degree, a reward of the righteous, and a punishment of the wicked, in a STATE,"—he does not say a *place*,—"in a STATE intervening between death and the resurrection." Again:—"The apostle Paul speaks of the souls as admitted to enjoyment, *in the presence of God, immediately after their death.*"†

The leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way are manifestly with us. For instance, Dean Stanhope says,—“The soul lives in a separate STATE from the body, and such a STATE as is susceptible of happiness or misery.”

Dr. Wheatly says,—“The interval between death, and the end of the world, is a STATE”—not *place*—"A STATE of expectation and imperfect bliss." Then he adds that the completion and perfection of their happiness take place at the last day.‡ Archbishop Secker thus writes:—"Hades means the invisible world, one part or other of which, the souls of the deceased, whether good or bad, inhabit." And he adds, that the saints are there, "waiting for a still more perfect happiness at the last day."§ Bishop Newton says,—“The separate souls are happy or miserable: but not so miserable nor happy as they shall be at the resurrection.”|| Bishop Mant, as quoted by Mr. Sherwood, is decidedly of orthodox belief. "The intermediate STATE,"—he does not say *place*,—"is one of rest and repose." He adds that this will be succeeded by another state of perfect happiness at the last day.¶

\* Serm. 164. Vol. iv. p. 423, New Haven edit. of 1823.—

† Vol. i. Diss. vi. Part ii. Sect. 19, 22.

‡ On the Com. Prayer, p. 304, Boston edition of 1825.

§ Secker on the Catechism, Lect. 9.

|| On the Intermediate State, vol. iii. pp. 559, 661, Lond. edit.

¶ Happiness of the Blessed, p. 10.

In a word, the ancient and sound fathers of this venerable section of the Reformed Church, do, to a man, believe as do their compeers of other Churches. But the party of the high churchmen within her, and those approximating to Romanism, do, to a man, advocate this *quasi* purgatory of an intermediate place of souls, *not* perfect in holiness.

We now proceed to examine the evidence of our doctrine derived from the Holy Scriptures.

The king of Israel declares that "the dust shall return to the earth, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." This, as will be more fully explained by the texts to be quoted, determines that the soul of the righteous at death is with God who is in heaven.

The prophet Isaiah assures the mourner that the righteous do, at death, enter into peace. That cannot mean the grave, for the wicked also enter the grave. It is the peace of God in heaven. "They rest on their beds." Their bodies sleep in the grave. "Each one walking in his uprightness." This indicates life, activity, and happiness. Let this be explained by the following texts; for the system of divine truth is unique and one.

On the mount of Transfiguration, Moses and Elias appeared in glory with Christ. They both appeared in glory. Moses therefore, as a pure spirit, was where Elias, in body and soul, was. But, we have the testimony of the Holy Spirit, that Elias "was taken up into heaven." 2 Kings ii. 1 and 11. Therefore, Moses was in heaven, and in no intermediate PLACE, "apart from heaven," and "out of heaven."

Our Lord, in refuting the Saducees, said, "The Lord is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob : he is not the God of the dead, but of the living : for all *live unto him*." Luke xx. 37, 38. Set down with this the words of Paul: "None of us liveth unto himself ; and no man dieth unto himself : for, whether we live, we live unto the Lord ; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord ; living, or dying, therefore, we are the Lord's." Rom. xiv. 8, 9. Hence the patriarchs, and all who lived to the Lord, have died to him. He is their God after death, as well as in life. They are with him ; for "they live to him." This implies presence with him, and happiness, and glory, as the necessary consequence.

When Stephen was dying, "he saw Christ standing on the right hand of God," and he said, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." This was spoken by one who was full of the Holy Ghost. It was therefore the prayer of one guided by

the Holy Ghost. Hence it was heard : and hence his soul was received by Christ, and was where he is. Therefore the soul of Stephen is in heaven, where Christ is.

The whole family of God, *named after Christ*, is in heaven, and on earth. Eph. iii. 15. This family is that which is named after Christ. Hence it includes all Christians only. But, they are "in heaven, or on earth." The departed are, of course, *in heaven*, as certainly as those who are *not* departed, are *on earth*. There is of course no middle place. It is unknown on the pages of the Holy Bible. They are all either in heaven, or on earth. Hence every member of Christ's family, when they leave the Church below, are received into the family of God above, in the heaven of heavens.

"Them that sleep in Jesus, God will bring with him." 2 Thess. iv. 14. In connection with this passage, take Jude, ver. 14. "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment on all." Nothing can be more evident than this, that when Christ comes to judgment, he will summon his *saints* as well as his angels, to attend him downward to the services of the last judgment. But in as much as he brings the SAINTS with him when he comes, it is quite evident they were *with him* previous to his descent to judgment. How could he bring them *with him*, if they had not previously been *with him*? Hence, departed souls are now with him, in heaven. And when he returns to his glory with all his triumphing saints, now invested with their bodies raised from the dead, "he will bring them with him," in the fulness of perfection in happiness and glory, to his everlasting habitations.

Our exalted Redeemer, in his intercessory prayer, John xvii. 24, says,—“Father, I will that those whom thou hast given me, be WITH ME WHERE I AM,” &c. Let this divine expression be explained in connection with *two* facts. 1st. That Christ ceases to plead for those who are dead. 2d. That, as we have already shown, he comes at death to each one of his people, to receive their souls to himself. Therefore, when the saints die, according to the will of God, and according to the intercession of Christ, they do go to Christ, to be WITH HIM, and where he is. But our Saviour is in heaven, in his glory. Therefore departed souls of believers do go into heaven, and its eternal glory. There is no way of evading this conclusion, but by making out one or other of two things. 1st. That Christ does *not* come to each one of



his ransomed children at death. But we have already shown, out of Math. xxiv. 44, and xxv. 13, that he does certainly so come in his infallible love of righteousness. Or, 2d. That our Lord's intercessory prayer is *not* heard, nor answered by the Father, even when, as his equal, he says,—“Father, I WILL!” But no one of these truths and facts can be questioned for a moment. Therefore, the souls of departed Christians are with Christ in the glory and happiness of heaven.

The apostle assures us, by divine inspiration, that “when the house of this tabernacle,” the body, “is dissolved” in death, “we have,”—he does not say *shall have*,—but “we *have* a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” Can any thing be more explicit? When the body is dissolved, the soul departs,—whither? “Into a house not made with hands, eternal, IN THE HEAVENS, where our Saviour is. The following adds the force of demonstration to this. “While we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord,” ver. 6, 8. To these, let me add the following:—“To me to live is Christ: to die is gain. To depart, and to be with Christ is far better,” Phil. i. 23, 24. Here the evidence is complete. To be absent from the body “by death,” is to be present with the Lord. When, therefore, we leave the body, we are present with Christ. But, he is in heaven in his glory. When, therefore, we leave the body, we are in heaven in glory and felicity with him.

Had Paul believed in the “intermediate place,” and had he been assured that his soul at death went into “a prison,” into “a place apart from heaven,” “a place away from heaven,”—most assuredly he never would have poured out his holy soul in this ardent desire. “To depart and to be with Christ, is far better!” We have, therefore, the whole weight of St. Paul's experience and divine inspiration against an “Intermediate Place.”

The apostle John was permitted, in the visions of glory, to have a glimpse of the Intermediate State in heaven. The souls of the martyrs he beheld in their glory. He saw them “under the altar;”—that is,—stripping the language of what is figurative,—he saw them at the feet of our Divine Redeemer, who makes intercession “at the golden altar;” even in the heaven of heavens. He “saw white robes given unto them.” And they are before the throne of God; and serve

him day and night, in the glories and felicity of the beatific vision. Revel. vi. 9, 10. vii. 13, 17.

Now, if there be an Intermediate Place, "apart from heaven,"—then is our Jesus Christ in his glorified nature in that Intermediate Place; and in a "place out of heaven." If there be an Intermediate Place, then is the throne of God there, in "a place apart from heaven," and "out of heaven." But these saints are at the feet of Christ; they are where he is: they are where the throne of God, and the Lamb, is. Hence, they are in a state, and place of perfect holiness, and in the glory and felicity of heaven, and in no Intermediate Place, "apart from heaven," and "away from heaven."

We may be allowed to advert again to the consolatory message of our Lord to John in Revel. xvi. 13. "I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write; Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours: and their works do follow them." This testimony is decisive. "The dead who die in the Lord, are blessed." "They are blessed from henceforth;" even from the moment of their departure, "they *are* blessed;" they are blessed from the instant that they are "the dead." Their death, and their blessedness in glory in the Lord, are instantaneous. Their blessedness, or glory, lingers not until the last judgment. It has already commenced. And it commenced at their death. Hence, from the hour of their death, the souls of believers are with the Lord in heaven.\*

We shall conclude with an examination of two Biblical expressions. The first is "*the bosom of Abraham.*" The souls of departed saints are, as well as that of Lazarus, in "the bosom of Abraham." See Math. viii. 11, 12. This is an exhibition of the joys of heavenly communion and glory, under the familiar figure of an intellectual feast and joyful flow of soul. As the beloved disciple reclined on the bosom of Jesus, at the communion of the first supper: so each of the departed saints in heaven reclines on the bosom of Abraham in glory. That is, they are admitted where that father of the faithful is; they enjoy the intimacy, the communion, and the fellowship, and the happiness, and the glory of heaven, in common with Abraham. We cannot con-

\* Schleusner, on the word *ἀπὸ*, observes that when it is construed with the preposition *απὸ*, as in this text under review, it denotes the present time, even this very instant. "They are blessed *from the very instant* of their death."

ceive any other meaning that can be attached to this expression. But Abraham, with the other patriarchs, is in no other place than the third heavens, or where "the Lord is, in his kingdom above." "Many shall come," said our Lord, in Math. viii. 11, 12,—“from the east, and from the west; and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.” Now, these patriarchs are dead, and buried. They do not belong to the Lord’s “kingdom of heaven upon the earth.” Hence they are in “the kingdom of heaven above; where the Lord Jesus Christ is; and where “the dead all live to the Lord.” Luke xx. 38. Rom. xiv. 8. This receives additional strength from the contrast in the following verse. To be out of “this state and place of Abraham,” is to be “with the rebellious children of the kingdom, who are cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.” As certainly, therefore, as the latter are in the punishment of Gehenna, that is, hell; so certainly are the former in the glory of heaven.\*

It now only remains, in the second place, to decide the import and location of PARADISE. The advocates of the intermediate place take very great pains to show that paradise is not heaven: but a “place out of it,” and “apart from it.”

There happens to be only one passage on which they expend their criticism to sustain that opinion. This passage is 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. “I knew a man in Christ, about fourteen years ago, whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth: such an one was caught up into the third heaven. And I knew such a man, whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth: how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.”

Here, say they, are two distinct visions. The apostle is first wrapt up into the third heaven: then, afterwards, in another vision, he is caught up into paradise. Hence they are TWO DISTINCT PLACES; and heaven is *not* paradise.

On this loose and inconclusive logic we beg leave to remark:—1st. That even were we to admit the supposition of two distinct visions, and raptures, it does by no means logically follow that there are two *distinct places* into which the apostle was taken up. All that can be logically inferred is simply this,—that Paul was caught up *twice*, into a place of

\* See Bernard De Moor’s dissertation on this, in Tom. vi. p. 607, of his Perpet. Comment. in Markii Compendium.



glory: that in speaking of the first rapture, he called it the third heaven; and in speaking of the second rapture, he called it paradise. The admission of two visions, therefore, will not prove that he was in two different places. This must be obvious to every scholar.

2d. Admitting farther, for the sake of argument, that these were *two* distinct places, it would clearly follow from the words of the apostle, that if there be any difference at all between these two places, paradise must be the principal, and most glorious place in the third heaven. For he speaks of nothing he had seen, and of nothing that he had heard, in the third heaven. It was paradise, that was the grand theatre of display in this sublime exhibition. It was in paradise that he heard unspeakable words, even words "not lawful to be uttered." Now, while this can be explained on our assumption, that heaven and paradise are the same place;—it is quite evident that those who make them two distinct places, must, by the most logical inferences, admit from these words of the apostle, that paradise is the chiefest place in the third heavens!

But, 3d. We can see no decisive evidence in the sacred narrative, that the apostle had two distinct visions: or that he makes heaven and paradise two distinct places. He sets down only one date,—namely fourteen years ago. When he mentions his rapture into the third heavens, he details nothing of aught he had seen or heard. He then repeats the wonderful statement, in order to give it a solemn and impressive emphasis; as if he had said:—"Yes, when speaking on the subject of revelations, and visions, I say, that I knew a man, fourteen years ago, caught up into the third heaven; which I also call paradise, into which I say, that man was caught up; and I call it distinctly by this name of paradise, in order to guard Christians against the whimsical fiction of the Jews, who, without any divine warrant, make paradise to be a place distinct from heaven. Now, in this third heaven, which is also called paradise, I heard unspeakable words—words not lawful to be uttered."

4th. Our Lord assured the dying penitent that "he should to day," that is, forthwith, "be with him in paradise." Now, while dying, our Lord cried with a loud voice,—“Father into thy hands I commend my spirit!” To be in “the hands of God,” is unquestionably the same thing as to be WITH HIM where he is, in the heaven of glory. And, assuredly, if “the spirits of just men made perfect” “return to God,” and are

with him, according to the testimony of divine revelation; beyond doubt the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, in answer to this parting prayer, went to God in heaven. For he uttered this prayer as one who had fully completed the work given him to accomplish; and who was, thence, to go to the Father, to be with him, henceforth. Hence, in his intercessory prayer in John ch. xvii. he said:—"And, now, I am no more in the world—AND I COME TO THEE." The departed soul of our Lord was, therefore, beyond all controversy, with his Father in the heaven of heavens, while his body was in the grave. By paradise, therefore, he meant heaven, whither he went at death; and into which he conducted the soul of the penitent on the cross. And the expression which the Lord of life, and of all the worlds, visible and invisible, uttered, is very remarkable. He did not say,—“I will be with thee;”—But, “THOU SHALT BE WITH ME IN PARADISE!” That is to say,—thou shalt be where I am. But our Lord was in heaven. Wherefore the penitent’s soul, which was in paradise, was in the heaven of heavens.

Lastly:—In Revel. xxii. 2, we have an impressive and heart-stirring description of heaven. No one will venture to deny that this passage reveals the reality, and particularities of the heaven of heavens. It follows consecutively, on the sublime and awful description of the general judgment, and can be referred to no other thing whatever.

Now, in this exhibition of heaven, THE TREE OF LIFE is set forth before us as occupying the midst of heaven. “It is in the midst thereof.” But there is only ONE Tree of Life. And that is the Lord Jesus Christ, the only source of our spiritual and eternal life; the only “way, and truth, and the life.”

Turn we, now, to Revel. ii. 7, and we find these words;—“To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of THE TREE OF LIFE, which is IN THE MIDST OF THE PARADISE OF GOD!” This, the one, only Tree of Life, is in the midst of heaven; and in the midst of the paradise of God. Therefore HEAVEN IS PARADISE: and PARADISE IS HEAVEN. And, hence, there is no *Intermediate place* of departed souls, except what exists in the field of fiction and romance.

ART. II.—*Ancient Fragments of the Phoenician, Chaldean, Egyptian, Tyrian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian, and other writers; with an Introductory Dissertation: and an Inquiry into the Philosophy and Trinity of the Ancients.* By Isaac Preston Cory, Esq., Fellow of Caius Coll. Cambridge. Second Edition. London: William Pickering. 1832. pp. 361.

OF the history of the earlier ages of the human race our knowledge is very defective. In relation to the period before the flood not a single document worthy of confidence exists, except those contained in the Hebrew scriptures. But the Bible makes no other historical pretensions than as respects the line of which the Saviour was to be born, and the records of the Jews as the people among whom it existed. Any other historical information it gives is only accidental. Nevertheless we find little else to rely upon concerning the history of the world during not only the age anterior to the flood, but also during more than one half of the period which has elapsed since that epoch. A cloud rests upon the beginning of our race—a cloud of fiction as well as of ignorance. Here, as in other subjects, we find ourselves bounded by the *inscrutable*, but more immediately by what we may call the *indefinite*, in which some things partially discovered lead out imagination, in the absence of realities, to construct a fabric of her own. And as, in most cases, where other minds have preceded, so here we are not made to feel, immediately upon reaching it, the limit of accurate knowledge, but become gradually sensible of it as the mists of theory and fiction part asunder and vanish away before stern inquiry. And it is no slight matter to resist the tendency to theorize upon the facts with which we may be furnished, and where these are defective, to supply the hiatus from fancied analogy. Truth we so much love, that where she is herself unattainable, we will worship even the image we have so conjured up to represent her. Fiction is pleasing only as the resemblance of truth, and theory is attractive only until discoveries are made to disprove; but the natural love for system and for completeness lead to it whenever knowledge is defective. As the imagination cannot be said to create otherwise than by re-producing, modifying, and combining into new connexions, the materials collected in various times and circumstances, and by lending its own character of spirituality to all. It therefore



can call up nothing radically new, but must carry out from the known all the materials of that with which it would people the unknown. In every tradition, however wild its character, it is our opinion there lie hid some seeds of truth. The tales of chimeras, of centaurs, &c. are most probably relations of real occurrences distorted by the multitude of hands through which they have come, and the arabesques with which imagination, playing with the vague and wonderful, has chosen to adorn them. Indeed the perfection of knowledge alone could prevent such from being the fate of all that is committed to the memory of man. For as darkness will magnify fear, not only by the addition of those terrors arising from obscurity and doubt, but also by affording place for the imagination to people with creatures of its own, so ignorance will often exalt to the supernatural, and invest with astonishing attributes what the light of knowledge would strip of all its wonder, by making it perfectly understood. Tradition generally long retains the more prominent features of the original story, but never without many modifications in the minor details;—and when no written records are preserved, many important transactions must come, in the course of time, to be forgotten altogether, from the crowding in of other things of later occurrence and more engrossing interest. Thus is excluded from the pale of authentic history, a large number of the earlier generations of mankind; as it could not be until after considerable advances had been made in civilization and the arts, that any other method of preserving the records of the past than oral tradition could be invented. The earliest fragment of a historical form, dates not farther back than the fourteenth century, B. C.; and even of that there is considerable doubt. This, however, is not altogether owing to the want of writing, but very much also to the fragile nature of the writing materials, and the limited number of copies which could possibly be published in those early ages, when the process of transcribing was so laborious, and readers so few. Frequent allusions are made by the oldest authors extant to others who had written before them. And strange indeed does it appear to us, who possess so many means of perserving literature, that all those works which we are told of as existing before the time of Homer, should have so completely gone the way of those transactions whose memory they vainly endeavoured to perpetuate, that scarcely one genuine fragment now remains. Thus has oblivion passed upon more than one half of the period of the existence of our

race, broken only in one direction by the writings of Moses. And even after this period, what is recorded, is but the annals of a small portion of the world, and that so mixed up with fable, as to make it difficult to know what to believe, and what to reject. Nor is it until the five hundredth year, B. C. that we meet with more than a distracted fragment of credible history.\* Knowing, therefore, so little of the early history of mankind, there is interest in every hint which adds, in the slightest degree, to our ideas on the subject. And the task performed in the volume which has suggested these remarks, although adding nothing to what we knew before, is one which lays us under considerable obligations, inasmuch as it brings together, into something like connection, the fragments of the literature of those olden times which lie scattered among various writers of a late date. Many of the pieces, as they stand here, it must be acknowledged, do not seem to possess the same degree of importance as they do in the connexion in which they are found quoted; and some to the mere general reader must appear unmeaning from the same cause. But it must be no little lightening of labour to the student of theology and of ancient history, to have thus spread before his eye, and put at once into his hands, what he otherwise must have obtained, if obtained at all, by long and persevering investigation. From our previous remarks, we should expect to find those remains of the past much mingled with fable; as most of the writers relate not the transactions of their own times, but what had come down to them remarkable from previous ages: and those having been long committed wholly to tradition, had, undoubtedly, received many modifications from the imaginations of the various relators. The most of the historical fragments are accordingly either allegorical genealogies, or tales of wonder concerning beings who seemed to partake, at the same time, of the passions of men, and of the power of Gods. We have every reason to believe that many of these writers did their

\* Herodotus did not write until about 430, B.C. The period of authentic history among the Chinese extends not farther back than the time of Confucius, who died, B. C. 477, and who must, therefore, have been nearly contemporary with Herodotus. The period of fable among the Hindoos comes down even later than the Christian aera. According to Klaproth, the authentic history of the Georgians commences in the third century, B. C.; of the Armenians in the second; of the Thibetians in the first century of the Christian aera; of the Persians in the third; of the Arabians in the fifth; of the Mongols in the twelfth; of the Turks in the fourteenth. Few European nations can state any thing with certainty of their ancestors before the time of Caesar.

best to arrive at the truth, but how was that truth to be obtained which lay behind some fifty or sixty generations, and obscured by the fiction which all these had combined to throw around it? Sanchoniatho, the earliest Gentile historian of whom we possess any remains, is indeed expressly stated to have been remarkably scrupulous with regard to the truth of what he related; but even with all his care, he seems to have been unable to gather the truth from the heaps of traditionary rubbish with which it had become confounded. Yet he certainly had access to the most trust-worthy authorities which the Gentile world could afford. He was a Phoenician, and is generally supposed to have lived somewhere about the thirteenth or fourteenth century, B. C. A native of Tyre, some say Berytus, and the chief priest of his nation, thus possessing the most authentic sources of information. He is said to have written several works, both historical and theological, in the Phoenician language, of which none are now extant. Whatever we have of his, we owe to those Greek writers who have quoted from him, and to Philo Biblius, who, in the second century, A. D., translated his Phoenician history into Greek, from which again only a few fragments have been preserved to the present time in the quotations of Eusebius. These are concerning the history and theology of Phoenicia, and are evidently possessed of much of that spirit which we have stated as characterizing all early historical compositions. Here, however, it is proper to remark that as we are not certain that we have his own words, so we cannot be confident that his statements have not been perverted. For not only is the original language of the author irretrievably lost, and the remains transmitted to us through several hands, but in addition to all this they are mingled with the remarks of the author by whom they are quoted so much and so inseparably, that it is often difficult to tell what is ancient and what belongs to the transcriber. And even sometimes it is not very clear that the expressions are those of the ancient writer at all, but rather a general statement of what he has recorded. And this remark applies to the majority of the fragments contained in the volume.

With whatever accuracy history may be written, it will, in the course of time, become obscure in many passages, as those contemporary circumstances which concentrated their light upon it, begin to fade away from the minds of men—things too, which, when the work was produced, were so



well known, that it would scarcely have been pardoned in the historian to have repeated them. His allusions also to things elsewhere, related in works so well known when he was writing, that it required only an allusion to call them up before the mind of the reader, and that in a more pleasing manner than by relating the whole—all conduce, as those contemporary works drop into forgetfulness, to darken the narrative. Explanation becomes necessary: but those who assume the task, under such circumstances, cannot always possess the means of correctly explaining every passage; and most commonly, they will be more willing to have recourse to conjecture than to confess their ignorance. And what is worse, they will not always distinguish their conjectures from the truth. Other passages they may honestly believe that they have explained, while they have themselves been completely mistaken. And sometimes a mistaken view of the general object of a work may lead to a perversion of the whole. All this taking place in times when the commentator did not content himself with annexing his views to the text, but most commonly mingled them up with it, came often with the best intentions in the annotator, to throw an impenetrable obscurity about some ancient writings. Thus it is stated of Sanchoniatho, that “he wrote his history of the Jewish antiquities with the greatest care and fidelity, having received his facts from Hierombalus, a priest, and having a mind to write a universal history of all nations, from the beginning, he took the greatest pains in searching the records of Taautus. But some later writers had corrupted his remains by their allegorical interpretations and physical additions. For the more modern priests or explainers of the Sacra, had omitted to relate the true facts as they were recorded, instead of which, they had obscured them by invented accounts and mysterious fictions, drawn from their notions of the nature of the universe. So that it was not easy for one to distinguish the real facts which Taautus had recorded from the fictions superadded to them. But he, (that is Sanchoniatho) finding some of the books of the Ammonei which were kept in the libraries or registries of the temples, examined every thing with the greatest care; and rejecting the allegories and fables which at first sight offered themselves, he at length brought his work to perfection. But the priests who lived after him, adding their comments and explanations to his work, in some time brought all back to mythology again. Notwithstanding all this, we are not inclined to reject these fragments,

perverted as they thus undoubtedly are, as altogether useless. But when we meet with one coinciding in important points with a professedly historical account, given elsewhere by another hand and in another country, we are disposed to allow considerable weight to its evidence. This, at least, it would seem to prove; that it was not a fiction of their own, but a tradition, common to both countries, which they related. Thus, Sanchoniatho's account of the creation, as given by Eusebius, is as follows: "He supposes that the beginning of all things was a dark and condensed windy air, or a breeze of thick air, and a chaos turbid and black as Erebus; and that these were unbounded, and for a long series of ages destitute of form. But when this wind became enamoured of its own first principles, (the chaos), and an intimate union took place, that connexion was called Pothos—and it was the beginning of the creation of all things. And it (the chaos) knew not its own production; but from its embrace with the wind was generated Möt; which some call Ilus, (mud) but others, the putrefaction of a watery mixture. And from this sprung all the seed of creation and the generation of the universe.

"And there were certain animals without sensation, from which intelligent animals were produced, and these were called Zophasemin, that is, the overseers of the heavens; and they were formed in the shape of an egg; and from Möt shone the sun, and the moon, the less and the greater stars.

"And when the air began to send forth light, by its fiery influence on the sea and earth, winds were produced, and clouds, and very great defluxions and torrents of the heavenly waters. And when they were thus separated, and carried out of their proper places by the heat of the sun, and all met again in the air, and were dashed against each other, thunder and lightning were the result: and at the sound of the thunder, the before mentioned intelligent animals were aroused, and startled by the noise, and moved upon the earth, and in the sea, male and female."

Afterwards he adds, "that these things were found written in the cosmogony of Taautus, and in his commentaries, and were drawn from his observations and the natural signs which, by his penetration, he perceived and discovered, and with which he has enlightened us." Now, however fabulous this account may appear, that there is a ground work of truth in it, we are assured, not only from the coincidences here and there with the Mosaic accounts, but also from the evidence of modern science, that the earth, as is here stated, must have

lain long in a state unfitted for any of those beings who now inhabit it, is demonstrated by the undeglabile facts of geology: which, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, is not in opposition to the account given by Moses. For he does not say that God created either man or the other animals at the beginning of the world. He merely states, that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; but as his business is only with the history of man, he enters not into any account of the length of time which the earth lay without form and void, or how long the darkness was upon the face of the deep before the sun and moon were called into existence, and the land and water were separated and both fitted for the habitation of those beings who now occupy them.\*

The next fragment, namely, the *Generations*, has much of the same character. Scatches of truth, evidently forming the ground-work: and the genius of Sanchoniatho, or more probably his commentators, having so connected and modified them, as to give them a symbolical meaning.

After Sanchoniatho, we have no historian of these countries until the fourth century, B. C., when the writings of Berossus and Manetho appeared. They were contemporaries. Berossus was a Babylonian, and in the time of Alexander the Great, was priest of Belus. Having obtained a knowledge of the Greek language, most probably from the Macedonians who accompanied Alexander, he removed to the Island of Cos, where he taught astronomy and astrology, and acquired so much celebrity among the Greeks, that a statute is said to have been raised to him at Athens, with a gilded tongue, as expressive of his accurate and wonderful predictions. Besides several other works, he wrote a history of Babylonia, in three books, which included also the history of the Medes. This work was extant in the time of Josephus, who has made considerable use of it in the compilation of his work upon Jewish antiquities, but nothing now remains except the quotations of Josephus, Abydenus, and later writers. He professes to have taken his facts from public records, and from chronicles, preserved in the temple of Belus. And doubtless, his office gave him access to authorities

\* The authority of Berossus is also to the point—"There was a time in which there existed nothing but darkness and an abyss of waters, wherein resided most hideous beings, which were produced of a two-fold principle."



the most trust-worthy to be found, since in all countries and ages the priesthood have shown themselves the most faithful guardians of literature. Notwithstanding the leaven of fiction has no less modified the facts in these than in the preceding fragments. Thus, "he mentions that there were written accounts preserved at Babylon with the greatest care, comprehending a period of above fifteen myriads of years;" which piece of information certainly does not conduce to strengthen our belief in what he is about to draw from them. But not to judge of facts a priori, we shall exhibit a specimen of these accounts, and allow it to speak for itself. He tells us that "in the first year, there appeared from that part of the Erythrean sea, which borders upon Babylonia, an animal destitute of reason,\* by name Oannes, whose whole body was that of a fish; that under the fish's head, he had another head, with feet also below, similar to those of a man, subjoined to the fish's tail. His voice, too, and language, was articulate and human, and a representation of him is preserved even to this day."

This being was accustomed to pass the day among men; but took no food at that season; and he gave them an insight into letters, and sciences, and arts of every kind. He taught them to construct cities, to found temples, to compile laws, and explained to them the principles of geometrical knowledge. He made them distinguish the seeds of the earth, and showed them how to collect the fruits; in short, he instructed them in every thing which could tend to soften their manners and humanize their lives. From that time, nothing material has been added by way of improvement to his instructions. And when the sun had set, this Oannes retired again into the sea, and passed the night in the deeps; for he was amphibious. After this there appeared other animals like Oannes of which Berosus proposes to give an account when he comes to the history of the kings.

Of this passage the Editor remarks. "Unconscious that Noah is represented under the character of Oannes, Berosus describes him, from the hieroglyphical delineation, as a being literally compounded of a fish and a man, and as passing the natural instead of the diluvian night in the ocean, with other circumstances indicative of his character and life,"—probably as good as any other explanation which could now

\* Certainly a very calumnious epithet when applied to a being who seems to have taught the Babylonian the use of reason, but so it is *appon*.

be given, though its worth may be judged of from the following passages, in which Noah is introduced under quite a different character, and at a different period. "This is the History which Berosus has transmitted to us. He tells us that the first king was Alorus of Babylon, a Chaldean. He reigned ten Sari:\* and afterward Alaparus and Amelon, who came from Pantibblon: then Ammenon the Chaldean, in whose time appeared the Musarus Oannes the Annedotus from the Erythraean sea. Then succeeded Megalarus from the city of Pantibblon; and he reigned eighteen sari: and after him Daonus the shepherd from Pantibblon reigned ten sari. In his time appeared again from the Erythraean sea a fourth Annedotus, having the same form with those above, the shape of a fish blended with that of a man. Then reigned Euedorachus from Pantibblon, for the term of eighteen sari; in his days there appeared another personage from the Erythraean sea like the former, having the same complicated form between a fish and a man, whose name was Odacon. Then reigned Amempsinus, a Chaldean from Laranchae, and he being the eighth in order, reigned ten sari. Then reigned Otiartes, a Chaldean from Laranchae, and he reigned eight sari. And upon the death of Otiartes, his son Xisuthrus reigned eighteen sari: in his time happened the great deluge. So that the sum of all the kings is ten, and the term which they collectively reigned an hundred and twenty sari."

The following extract, which is interesting from its remarkable similarity to the Mosaic account of the deluge, is decisive against the above mentioned remark concerning the Oannes. "After the death of Ardates, his son Xisuthrus reigned eighteen sari. In his time happened the great deluge; the history of which is thus described. The Deity Cornus, appeared to him in a vision, and warned him that upon the fifteenth day of the month Daesius there would be a flood, by which mankind would be destroyed. He therefore enjoined him to write a history of the beginning, procedure and conclusion of all things; and to bury it in the city of the sun at Sippara, and to build a vessel, and take with him into it his friends and relations, and to convey on board every thing necessary to sustain life, together with all the different animals, both birds and quadrupeds, and trust himself fearlessly to the deep. Having asked the Deity, whither he was

\* Saros.

to sail? he was answered, 'To the Gods,' upon which he offered up a prayer for the good of mankind. He then obeyed the divine admonition; and built a vessel five stadia in length, and two in breadth. Into this he put every thing which he had prepared: and last of all he conveyed into it his wife, his children, and his friends.

"After the flood had been upon the earth and was in time abated, Xisuthrus sent out birds from the vessel; which not finding any food nor any place whereon they might rest their feet, returned to him again. After an interval of some days, he sent them forth a second time; and they now returned with their feet tinged with mud. He made a trial a third time with these birds; but they returned to him no more, from whence he judged that the surface of the earth had appeared above the waters. He therefore made an opening in the side of the vessel, and upon looking out found that it was stranded upon the side of some mountain, upon which he immediately quitted it with his wife, his daughter and the pilot. Xisuthrus then paid his adoration to the earth: and having constructed an altar, offered sacrifices to the Gods, and with those who had come out of the vessel with him, disappeared.

"They who remained within, finding that their companions did not return, quitted the vessel with many lamentations, and called continually on the name of Xisuthrus. Him they saw no more; but they could distinguish his voice in the air, and hear him admonish them to pay due regard to religion, and likewise informed them that it was upon account of his piety that he was translated to live with the Gods; that his wife and daughter, and the pilot, had obtained the same honour. To this he added, that they should return to Babylonia; and as it was ordained, search for the writings at Sippara, which they were to make known to all mankind: moreover, that the place wherein they then were, was the land of Armenia. The rest, having heard these words, offered sacrifices to the Gods; and taking a circuit, journeyed towards Babylonia.

"The vessel being thus stranded in Armenia, some part of it yet remains in the Coreyean mountains of Armenia; and the people scrape off the bitumen, with which it had been outwardly coated, and make use of it by way of an alexipharmic and amulet. And when they returned to Babylon, and had found the writings at Sippara, they built cities and erected



temples; and Babylon was thus inhabited again." Syncel. Chron. 28. Euseb. Chron. 5, 8.\*

Manetho, whom we have named as contemporary with Berosus, was an Egyptian of Heliospolis, also a priest and expounder of the sacred mysteries at Sebennytus. At the command of Ptolemey Philadelphus, he composed a history of Egypt from the records preserved in the temples, and from ancient inscriptions. The work was divided into three books, and brought down the history of that country from the earliest ages to the time of Darius Codomanus, the last king of Persia. It contained a list of thirty-one dynasties, consisting of three hundred and fifty-two kings, who reigned during a period of 5471 years, which duration, being inconsistent with scripture chronology, has given rise to considerable discussion. The difficulty, however, seems to be solved by Marsham, who shows that many of the earlier dynasties reigned simultaneously in different parts of Egypt, by which he reduces the period to very nearly a consistency with the septuagint.† Manetho wrote also a work on Egyptian theology, an astronomical work entitled the Book of Sothis, which he addressed to Ptolemey Philadelphus, and an Epitome of Physics.

Fragments of his history have been preserved by Eusebius and Syncellus, of which the most important is the dynasties.

The following is the account of this writer given by Eusebius. "It remains, therefore, to make certain extracts concerning the dynasties of the Egyptians, from the writings of Manetho the Sebennyte, the high priest of the idolatrous temple of Egypt in the time of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus. These, according to his own account, he copied from the inscriptions which were engraved in the sacred dialect, and hieroglyphic characters, upon the columns set up in the

\* From the preceding extracts it will be perceived that wherever there is no coincidence with any scripture narrative, the story is perfectly dark, and to its meaning we can find no key; but where the same occurrence is related, as in some passage of the bible, while we feel the confirmation which it affords of the sacred account, we have something like confidence in distinguishing what may be true in it, besides those points which coincide with the scripture history. In this manner alone can these remains, universally mingled with fable as they are, be of any account as historical documents.

† This, however, is not taking the testimony of Manetho, but bending it before that of the bible. If, therefore, it is more correct after this modification, it could by itself have only tended to propagate error; for nobody would have thought of such an artifice as Marsham's, had not a more credible account been opposed to this.

Siriadic land,\* by Thoth,† the first Hermes; and after the deluge, translated from the sacred dialect into the Greek tongue in hieroglyphic characters; and committed to writing in books, and deposited by Agathodaemon, the son of the second Hermes, the father of Tat, in the penetralia of the temples of Egypt. He has addressed and explained them to Philadelphus, the second king that bore the name of Ptolemaeus, in the book which he has entitled *Sothis*.”

Megasthenes, the author of the fragments upon Judea, was a Greek in the employ of Seleucus Nicator of Syria, by whom he was sent out to Palibothra in Judea, in order to complete some treaty with the inhabitants of that country. Here he remained for several years; and upon his return, wrote an account of his travels, and what he found worthy of note during his residence in Judea. Of this writer, also, we have only some fragments preserved by the same means as the foregoing. Megasthenes was contemporary with Manetho and Berossus, and but a little the senior of Abydenus, who afterwards wrote a history of Syria, and various other historical works. In his work upon Syria he has copied a few passages from Megasthenes, which by a singular fortune, are thus preserved, while the treatise into which they were copied has itself been lost.

The fragment of the Carthaginian historian Hiempsal, which Sallust has copied into his history of the war with Jugurtha, is too well known to need any remark. Such are the principal ancient historians of the gentile world of whom we possess any remains. And the meagerness of these would add but little to our knowledge, had we not some clearer light by which to distinguish, from their fable, their scattered and

\* Of the Siriadic columns here mentioned, Josephus thus writes: “All these (the sons of Seth), being naturally of a good disposition, lived happily in the land without apostatizing, and free from any evils whatsoever: and they studiously turned their attention to the knowledge of the heavenly bodies and their configuration. And lest their science should at any time be lost among men, and what they had previously acquired should perish (inasmuch as Adam had acquainted them that an universal aphanism, or destruction of all things, would take place, alternately, by the force of fire, and the overwhelming powers of water), they erected two columns, the one of brick and the other of stone, and engraved upon each of them their discoveries; so that in case the brick pillar should be dissolved by the water, the stone one might survive to teach men the things engraved upon it, and at the same time inform them that a brick one had formerly been also erected by them. It remains even to the present day in the land of Siriad.

† Thoth he computes to have lived in the beginning of the first dynasty. A singular source certainly from which to copy the history of all the succeeding.

imperfect exhibitions of truth. Although they do not come directly under the design of this essay, it may not be amiss in this place to take notice of one or two of the more ancient philosophical or miscellaneous fragments. As they will go to show that that vague and indefinite manner of writing, as also the habit of mingling the fabulous with the true, was in early times not confined to history alone. One of the most interesting relicts of antiquity, which the volume contains, is the *Periplus of Hanno*, which is an account of a voyage undertaken at the command of the Carthaginian government, with the view of discovering new countries, and planting new colonies. The date of this expedition, it is now impossible to ascertain with precision. Fabricius thinks that it must have been about 300 years, B. C. Campomanes places it about the year 407, B. C. Bougainville about 570 years before our era, and others again are for placing it as high as 1000 years before Christ. The only means of making even an approximation to the true date, seems to be that passage of Pliny which states that Hanno and Hamilcon were appointed at the same time, the one to the south, and the other to the north of the Carthaginian Republic, during the time when that state was in its highest degree of prosperity. Now it would seem to be necessary only to find when, under these circumstances, a Hanno and Hamilcon came together at the head of government. And this is the means used to obtain the desired date, which might be satisfactory enough if we could also be assured that only one Hanno and one Hamilcon of distinction ever existed in Carthage together. But when we know that these names were very common in Carthage (so much so that few as we know of her citizens we have the names of some half dozen Hannos of distinction,) it is but arriving at an uncertainty after all. There appears to us, however, most probability in that computation, which places it between five and six hundred years before the Christian era. It was written in the Punic language, but very early translated into Greek. The Punic original, which was deposited by Hanno in the temple of Saturn, has been lost in the universal wreck of Carthaginian literature, but the authenticity of the Greek translation has been supported by the ablest scholars. With regard to the Sybilline Oracles, controversy has long resulted in a conviction of their spuriousness. That some of these fragments called Sybilline verses, are of high antiquity, there can be very little doubt, since we find them cited by Heraclitus five hundred years before the Christian era; and on this account, they possess great



interest as being remains of the literature of those early times. These Sybilline books, are also cited by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and some of the early fathers, many of whom considered them to be genuine prophecies vouchsafed by the Almighty to the Heathen world as those recorded in the Scriptures were to the Jews. There can be very little doubt, nevertheless, that the most of them are forgeries, and that of a comparatively modern date. A few at least, certainly ancient, are inserted in this volume.

Zoroaster is one of the greatest names of antiquity, connected with which every fragment is interesting; but so little certainty can be obtained on the subject of either the man or his works, that critics differ even with regard to the age in which he lived, by little less than two thousand years. And some go even so far as to deny his existence altogether. While some place him upwards of 2500 years, B. C., others are for bringing him down as low as five or six hundred years before the same era. Others maintain that there were two of the name. The first of whom they say was an astronomer, who lived at Babylon, about 2549 years, B. C. The second, a Persian, who restored the religion of the Magi, they place, some 587 and others 519 years, B. C. Others again suppose that there were many lawgivers and philosophers of that name. What has been given to the world, in a French translation, as the Zendavesta of Zoroaster, is considered of but doubtful authority. The fragments contained in the volume before us, must be allowed at least the merit of antiquity; having been pressed in the quotations of several ancient writers. As to the Orphic fragments, that they are ancient is the most that can with certainty be said of them.

In reference to ancient history, these remains do little more than render more sensible the palpable darkness which surrounds the subject, whenever the light of inspiration has not shone upon the eye of the historian; and while the records of every other country are enveloped in extravagance, down to a comparatively late period, those of the Bible are clear, simple, and consistent, even from the creation. If from those nations, the remains of whose history we have been considering, we look to the Chinese, or the Hindus, both of whom pretend to records of great antiquity, we find those records so mingled up and perverted by fable, that it is almost impossible to secure a single historical truth really ancient, from the hideously distorted mass. Nay, so utterly inconsistent are they with themselves, that it requires no contending truth to prove their obscurity; and in extravagance so far

beyond the capacity of the most credulous, that even those who place faith in them, are compelled, out of respect to their own reason, to understand them allegorically. Amidst such masses of fable, the few sprinklings of truth which may exist, would never be discovered to be such, did we not possess some more trust-worthy coincident information. In such connection they are useful, but in such connection alone.

The Scripture record, on the contrary, not only is consistent with itself, but found to be confirmed and elucidated by every truth which bears upon the subjects of which it treats. And not the least wonderful thing connected with it is the perfectness of its preservation, in being entire and unperverted by interpretations, though, to all appearance, it had no better chance of safety than many other works of antiquity, also considered of divine origin by those nations who possessed them. But then many of the priesthood could not but be aware that their holy books, as well as their religion, were very much a fabrication of some of their own class, and intended only as an instrument in government, and therefore could feel no check upon them in making any change, or putting any construction upon them, which they found expedient; whereas the highest of the Jewish priests were those who the most thoroughly believed in the divine nature of their religious books. The care which the Jewish commentators, therefore, took to keep their annotations apart from the text, and the jealousy with which the religious parties among them guarded against the interpolation of the others, no doubt aided much in the preservation of their purity; but nothing short of a heavenly origin can account for the fact, that while the records of other nations pretending to high antiquity are exposed and shamed, as the light of science falls upon them, those very discoveries seem to have been reserved for these later days, to establish and elucidate such passages of the sacred volume as begin to grow dim from the shade of antiquity, the withering up of the delicacies of language, and the changes which are ever passing upon human things. Nay, it is not too much to say, that we, in this present day, better comprehend many passages of scripture, than the people could possibly have done to whom they were at first delivered. So that, if we are not favoured as they were, with the immediate presence of God, we know more concerning his works, and can more clearly comprehend his designs. The fulfillment of prophecy has revealed its meaning, the monuments of antiquity made to render up the

records long hid beneath their mystic symbols, have borne testimony to the accuracy of sacred history, and every science, as soon as it dawns upon the human mind, sends forth a ray to elucidate some statement of the inspired penmen. And even these imperfect relics, as far as their truth can be discovered, all conduce to render our religion more and more an argument to control the reason, even in its worldly wisdom.

---

*Travels in South Eastern Asia, embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam and China, with Notices of Numerous Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire, with Dissertations, Tables, &c.* By Howard Malcom. In two vols. Third Edition. Boston, Gould, Kendal & Lincoln, 1839.

WE are satisfied, on good grounds, that very inadequate, and even erroneous, views prevail in the Christian community, in regard to the character and condition of the heathen, and the nature and results of missionary labour. These misconceptions are much to be regretted in their bearing upon the feelings, the hopes, the contributions, and the prayers of the churches; but they are especially so in their influence on candidates for the work of missions. They lead to the adoption of plans, and beget expectations which cannot be realized, and which consequently produce sad disappointments. Instances might even be cited where individuals have been led to abandon in despair a service which they undertook under such great misapprehension; and, perhaps, almost every missionary has experienced more or less of the painful conflict of feeling, attendant on the overturning of his preconceived notions, before his zeal and his hopes, come to rest upon the true basis, which nothing can even afterwards shake. Not only is all this undesirable, but it is wholly unnecessary. By this we mean, that the cause of missions does not stand in need of all or any of the misrepresentations, which have become so current, especially in anniversary addresses. Some of the points on which we believe exaggerated views are entertained, are the cruelty and wretchedness of the heathen, the desire for Christian instruction, and especially for books, the change of feeling as it regards Chris-



tianity, and the perfection and usefulness of the tracts and translations of the Bible now in use. We are well aware of the difficulty of conveying accurate impressions of things by mere description, and most of the erroneous notions alluded to have been wholly unintentional. A missionary, in describing what he sees among the heathen, is obliged to use the terms appropriated to the same objects in America, while there may be something in those objects, or circumstances connected with them, which require great modifications in the meaning of the terms. Thus, for example, he speaks of a college in India, of the senior and junior classes, of literary graduates, and immediately the mind of his reader forms to itself the idea of a college, a senior or junior student, or a batchelor of arts as they exist in America; while in reality the thing in question is so very different, as to require a different name entirely, if such a name could be found. The extent of the misunderstanding arising from this change in the meaning of terms, as applied to objects in India and America, can scarcely be perceived without personal experience of the difficulty.

Another fruitful source of wrong impressions is this. The missionary, or traveller, in describing the character of the heathen, for example, does so mainly by the statement of facts. In selecting his facts, he, of course, takes such as are remarkable, in order that they may strike the community with more force. Thus *extreme* cases become the best known, and come to be regarded as a *fair average* of the truth. What is *peculiar* and *rare*, is supposed to be *characteristic* and *common*. It is in this way that so much injustice has been done to us as a nation, by travellers from Europe; and quite as great injustice, in our opinion, has been done to the heathen, in the impressions of their character, which prevail in the religious world. Our feelings are often shocked by the recital of deeds of horror perpetrated in some heathen land; and we are too apt to consider them as characteristic of heathenism. We forget that such things are neither common nor peculiar to heathen countries; but liable to occur even among ourselves. In all the political evils of the heathen world, there are few evincing more cold-blooded cruelty than the horrors of the French revolution. The celebrated system of Thuggy, in India, its master piece in rapine and murder may almost find a parallel in the famous secret league so long the terror of Germany, or the inhuman marauders under the Italian Gasparoni. Even its horrid licentiousness might nearly be matched, by the disclosure of the deeds of infamy

which exist in our own cities. And almost as often are our feelings harrowed by the recital of husbands and fathers beating, murdering and burning their own wives and children, in a fit of beastly intoxication. All this is not the distinctive character of any nation, heathen or otherwise, but the result of human nature phrenzied by wild and wicked passions, and belongs to the records of every age and every country. Certain it is, that any one who takes his impressions of heathen character from the current descriptions of it, will be agreeably surprised to find them, on acquaintance, a sober, civil, rational, and often kind and generous set of men and women, just like other people. They are partakers of the same human nature, men of like passions with ourselves; and every man has in his own bosom, before the grace of God takes possession of it, a specimen, which may give him a better idea of the heart of his fellow man in heathen lands, than most of the representations which are current in the community.

Even the religious character of the heathen, grievously defective as it is, we apprehend is not well understood. There is more attachment to their religion, more faithfulness to its requirements, and more confidence in its efficacy, than we are apt to suppose. There is also less absurdity, by far, in their religious systems, *as they understand them*, than appears to us in the light in which we view them. One cannot overthrow their idolatry, for instance, by the course of argument which satisfies his own mind, and much less by mere sallies of ridicule or sarcasm. They can defend it most ingeniously and powerfully, on the same principles, and by almost the identical arguments with which a Catholic justifies the use of pictures in devotion. And any one who feels able to prostrate the gods of the heathen, in the field of debate, would do well first to prove his armor in argument with a well educated and ingenious Catholic. We misunderstand their views when we think them fraught with such absurdity. There is much truth mingled with their errors; enough to make them highly plausible, and difficult to refute. No mind of common sense, to say nothing of acuteness, (and the heathen have both,) would or could adopt the gross absurdity which is commonly imputed to them. The unexperienced disputant soon discovers this, and must stand about on another tack, before he can make headway with his opponents.

This is particularly the case with the acute and wily disciples of Mohammed. Witness their controversies with Martyn. We would particularly commend to the attention

of all who may be interested in this subject, the discussions alluded to, as collected and published by Prof. Lee. Though conducted with all the learning and ability of a finished scholar, gifted with the highest honours of one of the best Universities in the world, yet was the victory so uncertain, that the learned Professor expresses strong doubts, whether the least advantage was gained by the cause of truth. Nor are they by any means afraid of argument. They delight in it, and approach it with seeming confidence of success. We have known them to challenge the best qualified advocates of Christianity to public debate; and we repeat that those who expect ever to enter the lists with them, should study the subject deeply, and master it fully, before they venture to the field.

There is another topic deserving of remark in this connexion. There is neither so entire nor so universal a destitution of social duties and practical religious precepts, as might be inferred from the general statements in which it is common to indulge. It would be easy to cite some of the most touching cases of filial, parental and fraternal affection from heathen families. Perhaps there is no nation on the earth, where these so well deserve to be called *national* virtues, as in China. They are inculcated from the earliest infancy, and enforced by the strongest motives and heaviest penalties. They form the very basis of the whole political structure. It is a surprising fact, perhaps not generally known, that the Chinese code of morals inculcates some of the precepts which we are accustomed to think peculiar to the great Teacher of Christianity. The golden rule of religion "all things whatsoever ye would men should do to you, do ye even so to them," may be found in almost as many words in the precepts of Confucius—the proud boast of Chinese philosophy. Nor is it barely stated, but illustrated and enforced, both by reasoning and example. So also with the duty of forgiveness and love to enemies. The rules of morality acknowledged by the heathen, when compared with the Christian code, are extremely defective in the details, and grossly lax in practice. The grand difference is, that they do not, as the law of God does, *take hold upon the heart*. Hence arise a thousand subterfuges in the conduct of life, and deceit in every form is sanctioned whenever *concealment* is possible.

But it is time for us to state the bearing of these remarks on the work of Mr. Malcom. In reference to these several



topics, and some others of still more importance yet to be adverted to, we have been disappointed in these volumes. We had expected from the graphic powers of the author, and his opportunities of personal observation, to find a picture of the heathen world, not only accurate in the outlines, but true to life in its very shadings. But though he has made a strong impression on our mind, of honesty of design throughout, yet we are disappointed in a good many instances with the execution. There are marks of both haste and confusion; and like rapid travellers, he has often been deceived by appearances, and allowed the common train of thought and remark to carry off his own judgment. Unless we are ourselves mistaken, the impressions of the character and condition of the heathen, which a common reader will gather from his pages, are not such as familiar personal acquaintance will verify. Their effect will not be to clear away erroneous notions, and define with clearness and truth the grounds on which the plans and the hopes of missionaries should rest. He leaves candidates for the work of missions, in possession of the same vague, and often false, views of the character of the people, and the kind, quality and results of the labour to which they have devoted themselves. His book will not have the tendency to the extent we had hoped, to chasten and correct the expectations of the Christian community, and give them clear and correct views of the work of missions, and the real motives and encouragements to enlist and persevere in it.

This was one of the leading advantages we had expected from the visit of Mr. Malcom to the missionary stations of India and China. But the extent to which, in our apprehension, he has failed, in removing errors and defining and impressing truth, may give rise to a question as to the utility of a delegation, at least for purposes of information. The visit of such a personage is so cursory, that he is obliged in most cases to depend upon the statements and opinions of others, which might be transmitted without his intervention; or if he depends upon his own observation, he is liable, through haste, to grievous impositions and mistakes.

Perhaps we shall not have a better opportunity to correct a train of remark into which superficial observation has led him, than to introduce it in the way of illustrating what we have just said. We allude to the comparison instituted between Catholic and Protestant Missionaries in regard to salaries. It is stated that "the entire salary of a Catholic priest is one hundred dollars per annum," while that of American

missionaries, who are married, is six or seven times that amount. The inference from this comparison is any thing but fair. We have means of knowing to a certainty, that the former are the better provided for of the two. The fact is, their "one hundred dollars" is nearly that sum of *pocket money*, over and above their expenses; while American missionaries have an allowance *barely sufficient* to cover their expenses. The clothing of the Catholic priest is generally sent to him from Europe, besides numerous luxuries, including wines, unknown to our missionaries; while the peculiar tenets of the Catholic creed require the laity to supply all necessary subsistence and service to the clergy even *gratuitously*. We have no hesitation in saying that they live better, and have more menial offices performed for them, than most American Protestant missionaries with a salary of six hundred dollars. By having their expenses thus covered, one hundred may be considered a liberal allowance for contingent expenses. This is but a *specimen* of the erroneous impressions and injustice which may result from superficial observation, or the *partial* statement of facts. While Mr. Malcom seems to be sincerely anxious to do justice to the spirit and character of our missionaries, yet he more than insinuates that their mode of living borders on extravagance. We are not surprised that a cursory traveller should have come to this conclusion, but we are satisfied that it is *erroneous*; and a residence of a single year in any one place in India would have convinced him that it is so.

We believe that the error of our missionaries, if there be one, is on the other extreme. Such is the unanimous opinion of the English, and all who have resided in India for a series of years. American missionaries expend the least of any class of labourers in that field;—less than *one seventh* of the allowance of chaplains in the East India Company's service; and the consequence is, that they encounter toils and exposures which greatly impair their strength and usefulness, and shorten their days. Does the number of lamented deaths chronicled in our missionary periodicals, the multitude who return home with broken constitutions, worn out in the freshness of their youth, indicate indolence or ease? We cannot but regard this as a matter of vast moment, in the conduct of missions. It is miserable policy, viewing it even in the cold light of expediency, to send missionaries to India, at great expense, and require them, with the view of saving a few

rupees, to perform their own laborious menial offices, in that exhausting climate. We have in our own eye this moment, missionaries, who have encountered toils and exposures, contrary to their own judgment, and the remonstrances and expostulations of old residents, partly to avoid the *appearance* of extravagance, and partly to curtail their expenses a trifle; and the fatal consequences are on record, to the discouragement and dismay of the church, and unjustly charged to the deadly nature of the climate. We should be as anxious as Mr. M. not to foster extravagance or indolence; but we are satisfied to entrust this matter to the consciences of our missionaries, and our decided conviction is, that *in general* (there may be individual exceptions), the exhortation is much more needed to economise their *strength* rather than their funds. The cases are alarmingly frequent, when missionaries, by the time they have acquired enough of the native language to fit them for usefulness, are so worn down by excessive labour, and injudicious exposure, that their acquirements are nearly lost to the cause; and very often indeed, if they do not sink into a premature grave, they are compelled to abandon their field, and return to the lighter duties of the ministry at home. The difference between the habits and expenses of missionaries and ordinary foreign residents in India, is much greater than between ministers and lay gentlemen in America; and yet, if there be a case conceivable, where money should be subservient to health and vigour, it is that of a missionary in India.

There is another subject which we feel bound to notice, and yet we hesitate to do so, not because our own opinions are unsettled, but because we are afraid of misapprehension. In speaking of the measure of missionary success, frequently throughout the book, and again in a chapter devoted to the purpose, while Mr. Malcom's estimate, on the whole, is perhaps not excessive; yet some of his statements are adapted to mislead. We may cite merely as an instance (and we could add many others), the account of the Serampore mission, vol. 2, p. 45. "Few in number, and sustained by their own resources, the missionaries have given the world the whole Bible in Sanscrit, Chinese, Bengalee, Hindu, Mahratta, Oriya, Sikh Pushtu or Afghan, Cashmere and Assamee; and the New Testament in the Gujeratee, Kunkun, Multanee, Bikaneer, Bhugulcund, Maruar, Nepaul, Harotee, Kanoja, Mugudh, Oojuyine, Iumbo, Bhutneer,



Munipore, Bruj, Kemaon, Shreenagur, and Palpa; besides portions of the New Testament in various other languages." Now the *whole* truth in the case is, that *very few* of this long catalogue are sufficiently correct to admit of distribution, though there are thousands and tens of thousands of copies lying in warerooms in Calcutta; and a considerable portion of these versions, made almost wholly by unconverted natives, who did not understand what they undertook to translate, are so grievously deficient, that they cannot be used even as a *basis* for a new translation.

This statement is not made at random; for we have known cases where the skill of the best pundits, assisted by the knowledge of the missionary of what it should be, was often unable to discover an idea approaching the meaning of the original. One of this catalogue of versions was in a language which has never yet been found in any part of India. This curious fact places the moral character of the natives engaged in this work, in as doubtful a predicament, as their intellectual qualifications. The extreme uncertainty of this method of proceeding will appear from the specimen which Mr. M. gives us himself, of the translation of 1 Cor. 5: 6, "a little crocodile crocodileth the whole lump." How judicious it is, every one may judge for himself, when informed that the Chinese version, which cost years of intense study, and more than *a hundred thousand dollars*, is now scarcely heard of, except in reports from the Serampore depository. It is nowhere used for distribution, so far as we are informed, unless it be among the few Chinese, mostly expatriated convicts, in Calcutta and Bombay.

It is hardly necessary to say that these remarks are not dictated by any want of respect for the characters implicated. They were holy men; and as missionaries, perhaps never surpassed, and but seldom equalled, in point of talents and devotedness. Their praise is deservedly in all the churches. But it is no more than proper, that the churches should know that this immense work is yet to be done, so that they may not be disappointed when they find many more labourers and vast additional expense necessary to its completion. The lesson furnished by the number and extent of this kind of failures, ought not to be lost to future, and especially to young missionaries. We can hardly conceive of a piece of history illustrating more strongly the importance of concentrated and thorough effort, rather than diffused and superficial, of doing

a few things or even *one* thing well rather than attempting many great objects and completing none.

There is a vague notion in the minds of most candidates for missionary labour, and which the statements of Mr. M. tend rather to foster than discourage, that their efforts are to be on a vastly larger scale than if they were to remain at home;—that they are to do good by *wholesale*, to operate upon *nations* instead of petty parishes of a few hundred souls. These notions are essentially romantic; and if indulged, will be sure to result in sad disappointment. We cannot help thinking that the sanguine and prophetic strains, in which it is common to indulge in books, and sermons, and especially in anniversary speeches, on the successes of missions, are unhappy, and too often groundless. They produce vain self-confidence on the part of churches, and excite false anticipations in those who are looking to personal engagement in the work. Missionaries must not expect to operate at once on large masses of people. They must not expect to be hailed by waiting nations, and beset with anxious cries for the bread of life. They must be content to be brought in contact with *individual* minds, and even those encased in ignorance and prejudice. They must expect to labour with careless men, often disgusting in degradation, and ready to treat with neglect and scorn their kindest attempts to do them good. They must expect all the difficulties and discouragements incident to the life of one who strives to win souls to Christ. This was the lot of the Master himself while on earth, and he gave his disciples no reason to expect better treatment. The heart, warm with his spirit, will count it its highest honour and happiness to share in this very kind of toil. Missionaries should know beforehand that this is what they are to expect in going to the heathen; and if they shrink from the work, so be it. They had better not go. They are not “of the manner of spirit” needed for this work. It is worse than useless to disguise the truth. Let them understand distinctly, that they are going to prophecy in a valley full of bones, which are *very dry*; and let them have their faith stayed upon God’s promise and power, or they had better not attempt it at all.—The church too, on her part, must be content to send her ministers out to do this unpromising work, and pray for them with all the faith necessary to support them under these discouraging labours. And when the church and her missionaries come to feel aright, humbled as to their own ability, and the wisdom and efficacy of their own resources, and

cry mightily to God, we shall soon hear of a shaking among the dry bones;—bone coming to his bone and flesh covering them, an exceeding great army arising in “the valley of vision.”

If we could gain the ear of our missionaries abroad, we would suggest the necessity of great caution in transmitting their reports, and especially *isolated facts* to the churches at home. They are strongly tempted to portray their pictures in the highest colouring that truth will admit, in order to encourage their patrons; and then the effect is greatly increased by the false inferences which we draw from these facts, from our ignorance of attending and qualifying circumstances. In almost every instance, when we have had opportunities of verifying the result, the impressions thus created varied from the truth. It is almost impossible for us at home to make the allowances which are in the mind of the missionary, and hence his statements are liable to convey ideas widely different from those intended. The erroneous calculations, false hopes and consequent disappointments which ensue, enforce the necessity of extreme caution, in representing the condition and prospects of missionary stations.

There are still a number of points in the work before us to which we felt anxious to call attention; but our limits require us to pass on to the last chapter, on “the mode of conducting modern missions.” This, indeed, is obviously the most important subject in the book, and the enlightened discussion of it, was the second leading advantage we had expected from the opportunities of personal observation, enjoyed by Mr. M. But while we find in it some very judicious observations, we are compelled again to express disappointment. So far as he embodies the opinions of old and experienced missionaries, his suggestions have weight; but in most of the points where he assails those opinions, his very cursory observation, and entire want of experience, are very apparent; and from some of his conclusions, we dissent entirely.

We feel particularly dissatisfied with the discussion on the subject of schools and education; and the comparison of these with preaching, as a means of usefulness. Mr. M. does not seem to us to understand the true nature and object of this kind of missionary labour. In the comparison alluded to, he has certainly given us a complete specimen of what lawyers call “a false issue.” Nearly all that is said in favour of preaching, in contrast with a system of education,



is founded on the mistaken notion that they are *antagonist* means of accomplishing the same object; and that to justify the present attention paid to education, it must be proved, that "where the preaching of the gospel makes one Christian, education makes ten." All this is misconception. Christian education does indeed make many Christians directly, but the grand object of the system is to raise up an agency for preaching the gospel and to prepare the mind to receive it. It is the great means of calling into action and giving efficacy to the very instrumentality, which he extols so much, at the expense of its auxiliary. The real point at issue, is not as to the importance of preaching the gospel, as a means of grace in the conversion of the world, but as to the source whence preachers are to be obtained, and the class of persons and other circumstances most favourable to the efficacy of preaching. To decry schools, and urge missionaries to devote themselves to this work, is, in effect, to affirm that the ministry for the heathen world, must go from Christian countries, and labour indiscriminately with adults. We hold, on the contrary, that preachers must be trained on the spot; and that so far as missionaries do preach, they have the best prospect of usefulness by preaching to the young, and especially to the *educated* youth. Our reasons for the former opinion are, first, a sufficient number of ministers for the purpose cannot be obtained in Christendom; and, secondly, if they could be obtained, they never can be so well qualified for the situation, as well trained natives. The fact is, that a much smaller proportion of missionaries, than is commonly supposed, ever become qualified to preach the gospel with any tolerable ability, in the native languages. Missionaries themselves are often mistaken as to their attainments. Even Dr. Carey, after preaching two years or more, found, to his mortification, that he had never been understood. And it is hardly necessary to say, that much more is necessary than merely to be understood. The preacher must be master of the imagery, trains of thinking, difficulties and objections of those whom he addresses. He must be, what few but natives ever can become, perfectly familiar with the native mind. No conclusion can be clearer, than that the ministry of each nation must be furnished and trained within its own limits; and to effect this, is the grand object of missionaries.

The obvious objection to this train of remark will be that the adult heathen would, in this case, be left to perish. We

answer not *all*, and not *necessarily*. The knowledge of salvation, though not urged upon them all individually, (which it cannot be for want of ministers,) will be within their reach, if they wish to possess it. And if they do not, it is their own fault. But as a fact, they nearly all must and *will* perish. They have been neglected till they are already too far gone to be reached. But the loss will be infinitely more than made up by the greater number of the next generation, who will be saved, through the instrumentality of the great increase of native preachers now in process of training. If all our missionaries were to devote themselves to preaching, and neglect training up future ministers, a few perhaps, and *but a few* more of the adults might be saved; but then the next generation must get their whole supply, like the last, wholly inadequate and unqualified, from Christendom; and neither increase nor permanence would attend the work. And if there is a reason for one person multiplying himself by training many natives for the ministry, the same reason holds good for another; and is an argument for the *system* of schools. Preaching, we admit, is the great means of converting souls, but the question is who are to preach? foreign or native ministers? Shall foreign missionaries give their short and imperfect labours in this service, and leave no permanent agency; or shall they not rather train up tens and scores of native agents and leave behind them self-perpetuating institutions?

Much of Mr. Malcom's reasoning against schools, is reasoning against their *imperfections*, and not against the thing itself. The failures which he has cited, were the fault of the *plans* and *details* of the several systems of education formerly adopted, and not of the system itself as now understood. And the success in Ceylon, which he attributes to protracted meetings in contra-distinction to schools, is the fair result of a judicious and Christian system of education. Religious means, the warmest and most efficient kind, should never be separated from schools; much less should they be arrayed as rival measures in the work of missions.

This, however, introduces another view of the happy effects of education in promoting the cause. Aside from its indispensable importance, in preparing a ministry for the world, its influence is powerful and almost resistless, in preparing the way, and hastening the spread of truth and religion. If our object were not to raise up a native agency, but merely to devote our whole energy to personal effort for

the conversion of individuals, or to preach the gospel with the greatest effect, as Mr. M. contends, we would select the *young* as the subjects of our labour, and we would, as far as possible, first gather them into schools. For this course we have innumerable reasons, and it coincides with the opinion, as the practice proves, of nearly all experienced missionaries. In many places, in fact, there is no other way of obtaining an audience to preach to; and very seldom indeed can the *regular* attendance of any other class of people be secured. And it is of the greatest importance that their attendance should be repeated and constant. The missionary, in public preaching, labours under the serious disadvantage of having a new subject,—one so entirely unknown to his audience, that the fragments which they pick up in going and coming are almost unintelligible. A few sentences will satisfy the restless group that it is uninteresting, and they pass on; hardly deigning to stop a second time, should business even call them that way. How inadequate are these means to warrant the expectation of a general conquest over the opposition and prejudices of human nature! In a Christian land, where it is impossible to escape from all the memorials of religion, where the Sabbath and the sanctuary bring men statedly under its warmest influence, and where the convicted conscience lifts its repeated, faithful and pungent warnings on the side of truth, how difficult it is to make a permanent impression! How the mass heedlessly pass on, and perish after all! Now where there is *nothing* of all this, but *every thing* opposed to it, how modest and chastened should be our expectations! It is not from a loss of piety, or devotedness, as Mr. Malcom more than intimates, vol. 2, p. 270, that missionaries have so far abandoned this sort of labour, but because experience has *driven* them to the adoption of other measures.

The system now becoming so general, of training up the young on Christian principles, greatly diminishes the difficulties alluded to, and produces much more extensive permanent and happy results. It affords the opportunity of eliciting and cultivating both the mind and the heart, and of forming the habits; so that while the intellect, under the influence of reason and truth, repudiates the false systems that degrade and fetter the mind educated to believe them, the moral feelings are incomparably more susceptible to the impressions of religion. It seems, also, as a bond to retain them under the influence of the missionary, long enough to obtain



a competent knowledge of the nature and principles of Christianity, and to feel the full power of its vast compass of motives, kept steadily before the mind. A more interested audience, or a more promising class of youth, are not to be found even in Christian countries, than that furnished by the pupils of the several institutions, especially the Scotch College, at Calcutta, or the Mission Seminary at Batticotta.

We differ entirely from our author, in the opinion, that the conversion of an adult heathen is of more importance to the cause of religion, 'than that of the youth of the schools. We are surprised that his observation has not informed him of the distrust and comparative uselessness of such converts, as agents in the spread of religion, occasioned by inveterately bad habits, and by the remains of the deceit and gross corruptions of heathenism. The immense number of apostacies, and the still greater number of grievous inconsistencies which attend these cases, have been the most fruitful source of discouragement and complaint to every missionary. From all these disadvantages the youthful convert to Christianity is comparatively, and often entirely, free; while his age and intellectual capabilities admit of his becoming an efficient agent in the spread of truth and piety. But it is not merely in furnishing well qualified champions of truth, and ministers of religion, that the conversion and education of the young is specially important; but also in securing the effects of elementary Christian instruction to as many as possible of both sexes of this important class of society. They soon become the influential heads of families, which are trained in their turn on similar principles, under the sanction of parental precept and example. Through each of these, again, branched into numerous descendants, and interwoven in the complicated relations of life, the good leaven may be transmitted, until families, relatives, societies, and finally, it may be hoped, *nations* will feel the extending influence, and the whole be leavened.

The substance then of what we have to say in defence of the existing system of education, is that the young form altogether the most hopeful class of subjects for Christian efforts, that their collection in schools is the best and often the only way of bringing them under the constant, full and continued influence of truth and piety, and that it is of transcendent importance in furnishing a native Christian agency, 'for perpetuating and extending the institutions, and the spirit of religion. The reason why so little good has heretofore re-

sulted from mission schools, is that the course of instruction was too short, too superficial, and too much disconnected with the incessant, fervent, and prayerful use of the means of grace. The system of Christian education adopted within the last ten years, and now growing into general use, (of which the American Seminary in Ceylon and the Scotch College in Calcutta may be cited as examples,) has already begun to yield most delightful results. Indeed the old systems of education were far from being unproductive of good. Their great defect was that they led to comparatively few conversions to real piety; but their influence in the diffusion of mere scientific truth, is felt throughout the whole of India. The prevalent sentiment of both natives and foreigners would fully bear out the opinion we have lately heard expressed by one of the most acute and accurate observers of the times, that "nothing but a revolution to break up the whole existing organization in India, can prevent it from becoming a Christian country."

Nothing, however, could be farther from our intention, than to intimate that any system of means, however appropriate or well adopted, is sufficient of itself to effect the desired change. No process of education, no kind or amount of preaching, can ever spiritually enlighten or convert a single heathen soul. It may dispel the darkness of the intellect, and demolish by the force of reason, false systems of religion, and yet leave the *heart* untouched. The effect, in such cases, has often been to make men sceptical as to all religions; and at best, it can only convert paganism into *nominal* Christianity. This last, indeed, is no undesirable attainment: but still it falls infinitely short of the object in view,—the conversion of the *souls* of the heathen. To this, no power is adequate but the influence of the Holy Spirit; and no duty is more imperative on the church, none more vital to the success of her efforts to regenerate the world, and yet none more grievously neglected than that of ardent, untiring and believing prayer for the promised gift of the Holy Ghost. This is the "one thing needful," in the present posture of the heathen world. "The way of the Lord" is sufficiently "prepared" in many places, to admit of a glorious and triumphant display of his grace; and the abundant dispensation of this blessing in the Sandwich Islands, and still more recently in the northern provinces of India, seem to indicate that he "waits to be gracious." In view of these illustrations of the promise, that the time is coming when

"nations shall be born in a day," the church and her missionaries should stir themselves up to plead the fulfilment of that promise, and at the same time tax their utmost energy and resources to educate, and get in readiness, a native ministry; so that the spectacle may not occur again, which is now witnessed in Bengal, of more than fifty villages turning, as one man, from the gods of their fathers, and imploring a teacher to unfold to them the consolations and hopes of the Christian religion, and yet no teacher be found. The whole tenor of the prophecies leads us to anticipate astonishing movements among the nations, and nothing could illustrate more clearly, or enforce more strongly, than such incidents as that alluded to, the necessity of preparing beforehand, and as speedily as possible, a native agency to control them, and to meet the wants they will disclose.

There are two or three other topics in the concluding chapter of the work before us, that we meant to touch upon; but we have already exceeded our intended limits. We cannot, however, refrain from remarking, that we accord most fully, not only in the correctness, but the importance of our author's sentiments in relation to tracts and translations, and missionary physicians. We commend the paragraphs in question to the attention of all who may be in any way interested in the subject; and we could add many important facts, tending to the same conclusion. We are satisfied that these measures should be regarded only, as in a small degree, *subsidiary* to the great plans and operations of the church in the work of missions. They should never be looked upon as prominent, or primary. We fear that the disadvantages attending the use of these means have been overlooked; and that expectations are based upon them, which are destined to disappointment. The facts in the case are but partially known, and false inferences have been drawn. But we cannot go into the subject at present.

We have only to say, in conclusion, that our strictures have been mainly confined to what we deem objectionable features in the mode of presenting this great subject. We have not space to enlarge on the merits of the work under review—and it has its merits. The general plan of the work is excellent; and it embodies an immense mass of facts.



- ART. IV.—1. *The present Conflict between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts Examined, with Historical and Statutory Evidence for the Jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland.* By the Rev. Andrew Gray, A.M. Second Edition. Edinburg, 1839.
2. *Substance of a Speech delivered in the General Assembly, on Wednesday, the twenty-second of May, 1839, respecting the Decision of the House of Lords, on the Case of Auchterarder.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. LL.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburg, and Corresponding Member of the Royal Institute of France. Second Thousand. Glasgow, 1839.
3. *Speeches of the Rev. D. Burns, Rev. Robert S. Candlish, and Alexander Earle Monteith, Esq., in the General Assembly, on May 22, 1839, in the Auchterarder Case. With an appendix.* Second Edition. Edinburg, 1839.

IT is natural for orthodox Presbyterians, in the United States of America, to feel a lively interest in the continued prosperity of the church of Scotland, for they have derived their existence from that body, and perfectly agree with her in matters of doctrine and discipline; in the forms of worship and church government.

The Presbyterian church in this country, having recently passed through a severe conflict herself, and having been threatened with a serious collision with the civil courts, is prepared to sympathize with the mother church, in the conflict which she has endured, the issue of which has been so unfavourable to the peace and prosperity of that venerable church.

In the review of these interesting pamphlets, we propose to furnish our readers with a concise, but perspicuous view of the AUCHTERARDER CASE, as it is called: it having originated in the parish and presbytery of Auchterarder.

It is well known to our intelligent readers, that the law of patronage has always been a source of discontent to many persons in the established church of Scotland; and that it has had no small share in increasing the number of dissenters from the church; one respectable body of whom profess no other ground than this for their separation. For more than half a century, the General Assembly had so far taken part with the patrons, and against the people, that when a candidate was presented, they compelled the presbytery to ordain

and introduce him, notwithstanding the opposition of a majority of the people. Such an infringement on the rights of the people, the Scottish spirit, always jealous of religious liberty, could not, with patience, brook. For many years past, earnest complaints, petitions, and remonstrances have been presented to the successive Assemblies, to have this grievance mitigated or removed. At length, and but recently, the continued and systematic efforts of the opposers of the abuses of patronage so far prevailed, that a law was passed by the General Assembly, and then sent down to the presbyteries for their approbation, agreeably to the provisions of the *barrier* act, prohibiting the settlement of any candidate presented by any patron, unless a majority of the lawful voters in the parish were in his favour. This act was proposed by Dr. Chalmers, and received the denomination of the *Veto Act*. But as this whole matter is clearly stated in the speech of A. E. Monteith, Esq., before the General Assembly of May last, it will be best to give the statement in his own words. "In the year 1834, in compliance with a very generally expressed wish of the church, this Assembly passed a declaratory act, commonly known by the name of the *Veto Act*, embodying a declaration of the principle of the non-intrusion of ministers, or, in other words, that ministers should not be inducted into parishes contrary to the will of the Christian people, as a fundamental and essential principle of the church of Scotland. This law was sent down to presbyteries under the *Barrier Act*, and after being approved by a large majority of those presbyteries, it was declared to be a standing law of the church.

"Whatever doubts may exist as to the policy or expediency of this law, whatever opinions may be entertained respecting its affecting the civil rights of patrons, no man can doubt, that being a law in relation to the constitution of the pastoral relation, it was a law regarding a spiritual matter. At all events, whether right or wrong, expedient or inexpedient, as to which I shall speak presently, it undoubtedly became a law of the church.

"Such being the law of the church, a person by the name of Young received a presentation to the church and parish of Auchterarder, from Lord Kinnoul, the patron of that parish. The presbytery, under the direction of the inferior courts of the church, proceeded to apply the law to the case of Mr. Young, and finding that a large majority of the parish were opposed to him, they refused to take steps for his ordination

or induction. In doing so, it will be remarked, that the presbytery of Auchterarder not only obeyed a standing law, but acted under the immediate advice and direction of the supreme court of the church, to which they had made a reference, and the order of which they could not have disobeyed, without subjecting themselves to ecclesiastical censures, and it might be to deposition.

“Mr. Young, considering himself aggrieved by this decision, had recourse to the civil courts for redress, and having obtained the patron’s concurrence, he instituted that action in the court of session, of which we have heard so much. In that action the presentee did not venture to conclude that the civil courts should order the presbytery to ordain and induct him, which, although truly his object, would have been a proposal too startling to have been made in direct terms. He brought his action in a declaratory form, the leading conclusion on which he insisted, being that the presbytery of Auchterarder had illegally, and in violation of their duty, refused to take him upon trial, and to receive and admit him a minister of the parish.

“Against this action, the leading defence of the presbytery was, that although the court of session had the sole jurisdiction, in so far as regarded the temporalities of the benefice, they had no jurisdiction, in so far as regarded the ordination and induction of the presentee, as, by the statute law of the land, all matters relating to the trial and induction of ministers, were subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the church courts, whose sentences were declared by the legislature to be final and conclusive.

“After a variety of procedure, with which it is unnecessary to detain the house, the same came to be advised. The court were much divided on the subject. Not less than five judges, of whom it is not too much to say, they are excelled by none in learning and intelligence, were decidedly of opinion that the civil courts had no jurisdiction. The majority of the court, however, were of a different opinion, and pronounced a judgment, and find that the presbytery, in rejecting Mr. Young, under the provisions of the Veto Act, had acted illegally, and in violation of their duty; and the case having been appealed, the judgment was ultimately affirmed in the House of Lords. Such, sir, is the present situation of matters in reference to this case. On the one hand, the church courts maintain, that the ordination and induction of Mr. Young are spiritual matters, falling under their exclusive



cognizance, and have decided in regard to them according to what is admitted by every one to be the existing law of the church. On the other hand, the court of session, as the supreme civil court of Scotland, contend, that they not only have jurisdiction in the matter, (which in so far as the civil patrimonial rights of the parties were concerned, was never disputed,) but also, that they have a right to direct and control the ecclesiastical proceedings of the church courts, in the spiritual matters of ordination and induction, on the ground that the civil rights of the presentee to the manse and stipend are affected by them. It is true, that the civil courts have not yet been asked to pronounce a direct order upon the presbytery, to proceed with the ordination and induction, but they have declared that in refusing to proceed, the Presbytery have acted illegally: and if it be true that the Presbytery have acted illegally, and the court of session have a jurisdiction in the matter, beyond the mere temporalities of the benefice, I cannot see any ground for hesitating as to the inference, that the court of session are entitled to order the presbytery to proceed with the ordination and induction of Mr. Young; an order which the presbytery cannot obey, without violating an existing law of the church, and breaking their ordination vows, which bind them to give obedience to that law.

“This was the position of the matter when the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland met, last May. All parties in the church seemed to feel that the position in which they were placed was a very painful one; but in regard to the proper mode of proceeding to avoid a direct collision with the civil courts, there was much diversity of opinion. Three distinct motions in relation to the subject were laid on the table of the Assembly, by the Rev. Dr. Cook, the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, and the Rev. Dr. Muir, respectively. Dr. Cook’s motion, after a preamble, in which the several steps in the legal and ecclesiastical proceedings are stated, contains the following resolution, viz: ‘That the act on calls, commonly called the Veto Act, having been then declared, by the supreme civil tribunals of the country, to infringe on civil and patrimonial rights, with which the church has often and expressly required that its judicatories should not intermeddle, as being matters incompetent to them, and not within their jurisdiction, it be an instruction by the General Assembly to all presbyteries, that they proceed, henceforth, in the settlement of parishes, according to the practice which

prevailed previously to the passing of that act; keeping especially in view the undoubted privilege of parishioners to state, at the moderation of the call, any relevant objections to the induction of presentees; upon which, presbyteries, after hearing parties, shall decide;—it being in the power of these parties to appeal, if they see cause, to the superior church courts.’”

This motion embodied the opinion of that party in the church, which had long been predominant, and which had for nearly a century supported the claims of patrons in opposition to the right of the people to choose their own pastors. This party, however, had now ceased, for several years, to be a majority in the General Assembly; yet they continued to maintain their former principles and policy. They had of course opposed the veto act in all its stages; and now was a favorable opportunity to have it repealed or nullified.

The motion submitted to the Assembly, by Dr. Chalmers, was in the words following, viz: “The General Assembly having heard the report of the procurator on the Auchterarder case, and considered the judgment of the House of Lords, affirming the decision of the court of sessions, and being satisfied that by the said judgment, all questions of civil right, so far as the presbytery of Auchterarder is concerned, are substantially decided, in accordance with the uniform practice of this church, and with the resolution of the General Assembly, ever to give and inculcate obedience to the decisions of civil courts, in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by the law to the church, instruct the said presbytery to offer no further resistance to the claims of Mr. Young or the patron, to the emoluments of the benefice of Auchterarder, and refrain from claiming the *jus devolutum*, or any other civil right or privilege connected with said benefice.

“And whereas the principle of non-intrusion is one co-eval with the Reformed Church of Scotland, and forms an integral part of its constitution, embodied in its standards, and declared in various acts of Assembly, the General Assembly resolve that the principle cannot be abandoned, and that no presentee shall be forced upon any parish, contrary to the will of the congregation.

“And whereas, by the decision above referred to, it appears that when this principle is carried into effect, in any parish, the legal provision for the sustentation of the ministry in that parish may be thereby suspended, the General Assembly, deeply

impressed with the unhappy consequences which must arise from any collision between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and holding it to be their duty to use every means in their power, not involving any dereliction of the principles and fundamental laws of their constitution, to prevent such unfortunate results, do therefore appoint a committee for the purpose of considering in what way the privileges of the national establishment, and the harmony between church and state, may remain unimpaired, with instructions to confer with the government of the country if they see cause."

In this motion of Dr. Chalmers, there is much evidence of wisdom, moderation, and firmness. He concedes every thing which the civil courts have any right to claim, but in regard to the principle of the right of the people, and of the church, he takes a firm stand, and declares that this ground cannot be abandoned. But dreading a collision with the civil authorities, he proposes the appointment of a committee to enquire what could be done to prevent an evil so much to be deprecated.

Dr. Muir, not being satisfied with either of these motions, offered a third. It would seem, that although not opposed in sentiment to the *veto act*, yet he was not willing to take ground which would bring the church into collision with the state; but was disposed to succumb to the decision of the court of session, as confirmed by the House of Lords. He wished, however, that it should be left to presbyteries to determine whether a candidate was a suitable minister for the people, over whom he was about to be placed. As we understand the motion, Dr. Muir was willing to waive the principle, that the consent of a majority of the people should be necessary; provided the presbytery, after due examination, were satisfied of the fitness of the candidate. But the reader may judge for himself respecting the true intention of this motion; it is as follows: "That the Church, more effectually to accomplish *that* which has ever been the design of her enactments relative to the calling and inducting of ministers—viz, the receiving for vacant parishes of persons not only irreproachable in moral character, sound in doctrine, and of adequate learning, but also suited to the parishes to which they are nominated,—did pass the act on calls, commonly called the *Veto act*. 2. That in passing this act of her own will, and carrying it into effect, the church was influenced by the belief, that this act being, not only in its nature, but also in its consequences, strictly and purely spiritual, there



was no necessity to obtain previously, the concurrence of the legislature to it. 3. That the decision of the supreme civil tribunal, in the recent case of Auchterarder, has determined that the consequences of this act do infringe on civil and patrimonial rights; and that hence it is ascertained to have been incompetent to the General Assembly to enforce the said enactment, without first having obtained the sanction of the Legislature. 4. That the church, however, while giving and inculcating implicit obedience to the decisions of the civil courts, in all matters relating to a civil right, ought not to forego the steady prosecution of her own high purpose of securing, more effectually, the appointment of ministers, not only sound in doctrine and morals, but also suitable to the parishes to which they are nominated. 5. That the suitability of presentees for the parishes to which they are nominated, and all circumstances and considerations for ascertaining *that* suitability in each particular case, whether as to the situation or mind of the people, or as to the special qualifications of the presentees themselves, ought to become the subjects of investigation and judgment to presbyteries, in the discharge of their solemn duty in filling up vacancies, as well as the usual and general qualifications in candidates for the sacred ministry. 6. That a committee be appointed to consider and to report as to the plan which may be best calculated for attaining this important end, and whereby, consistently with the acknowledgment and enforcement of such civil rights as are recognised by the law of the land, the spiritual interests of the Christian people, the judicial character and privileges of the ecclesiastical courts, and the professional character and usefulness of probationers may be effectually maintained, and the union between church and state be preserved entire."

When the several motions were laid on the table, Dr. Cook's being first in order, he stated his views at full length; and in conclusion, said that he was willing to add to his motion, (as he did before the vote was taken,) these words, "As also that in terms of the declaration of the General Assembly, at Edinburg, on the 29th of August, 1639, as interpreted by the concluding act of the General Assembly of St. Andrews, on the 2d August, 1642, all ministers or entrants presented to kirks, be tried before their admission, if they be qualified for the places to which they are presented, besides the ordinary trials of expectants, before their entrance to the ministry."

Dr. Chalmers followed Dr. Cook in a very long and able speech, at the close of which he proposed the motion already cited. Here it may be proper to inform our readers, not already acquainted with the fact, that in the debates of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the same order is not observed as in our General Assembly, and other deliberative bodies in this country, in which but one motion can be before the body at one time. In the Scotch Assembly, on all important questions, there is a motion and a counter motion before the body at one and the same time. Dr. Cook's and Dr. Chalmers' motions were both discussed at once. And, indeed, Dr. Muir's was also discussed with the others. The debate was long, able, and animated. And when the first vote was taken, for what reason does not appear, it was between the motion of Dr. Chalmers and that of Dr. Muir, when there appeared a majority in favour of Dr. Chalmers' over Dr. Muir's of 36, and on the second vote, a majority over Dr. Cook's of 47. At the time of the vote, Dr. Chalmers was not in the house.

A great many members entered their dissent against the decision of the Assembly, and Dr. Cook declared his intention not to serve on the committee to be raised under Dr. Chalmers' motion, and the Earl of Dalhousie, in declaring a similar intention, took occasion to state, in consequence of the resolution the house had come to, that he would withdraw altogether from the General Assembly. At the conclusion of his speech, accordingly, the noble lord immediately left the house.

The committee, as named by Dr. Chalmers, were, the Moderator, Dr. Muir, Mr. Candlish, Dr. Gordon, Alexander E. Monteith, Esq., J. Maitland Hogg, Esq., Dr. Makellar, J. Hope Johnstone, Esq., Sir C. D. Ferguson, Bart., James Smith, Esq., Dr. Smith, the Lord Provost of Glasgow, Principal M'Farlan, Robert Bruce, Esq., Lieut. Col. Dundas, Claud Alexander, Esq., Dr. Cook, Principal Dewar, Mr. Robertson of Ellon, J. C. Brodie, Esq., G. Buchan, Esq., Alexander Dunlop, Esq.

Principal M'Farlan, Dr. Cook, Mr. Robertson, and Sir Charles D. Ferguson requested their names to be withdrawn from the committee. The committee was then completed by the addition of Dr. Chalmers, the Procurator, J. Stewart, Esq., and with power to add to their number.

When this case was before the House of Lords, it was

argued in favour of the decision of the court of session, and against the church, by Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham, former Chancellors of England.

Among the speeches delivered in the General Assembly, none that we have seen, is, in point of clearness and force of argument, at all equal to that of Alexander E. Monteith, Esq. He supported Dr. Chalmers' motion. In speaking of the probable consequences of taking this ground, he admits that the church would materially suffer in her temporal interests; then he goes on to say, "At the same time, sir, there may be evils to the church greater than the loss of a part, or even the whole of her temporalities. I presume there is no member of this House who will venture to avow the opinion, that it would not be an infinitely greater evil for her to abandon those spiritual rights and privileges, which are essential to her character as a Christian church, without which she must be degraded from being an instrument of spiritual usefulness to the people, into being a mere political engine of the state, without which she might indeed continue to subserve the purpose of a preventive police, (which some parts of the argument of the reverend doctor opposite would lead us to think that he regarded as her most important function,) but could not for a single moment aspire to the dignity or sacred character of a church of Christ. That this must be the result of submitting her spiritual functions to the control of the civil courts, is what no man who understands the first principles of a Christian church, can gainsay or deny; but what is of greater importance to the question before the House, no man who attends to the principles on which the Church of Scotland is established, and to the jurisdiction which is vested in her courts by the statute law of the realm, can doubt, that it never was the intention of the legislature to establish a system involving elements so subversive of the true ends and objects of a Christian church, as those which are involved in the proposition, that her proceedings in matters purely spiritual, are to be subjected to the jurisdiction of the civil courts."

Dr. Cook and his friends, in support of his motion, had pathetically represented the unhappy consequences of a collision between the church and state, which they predicted would be the consequence of adopting Dr. Chalmers' motion. In reply to this Mr. Monteith says, "I deny that the church, in this matter, stands opposed to the state. I deny that there is any collision between the church and the state. The col-



lision, if there is one, is between the civil and ecclesiastical courts, between the church courts and the court of session, each of which equally derives its authority from the state, and which authority, in so far as it is vested in them respectively, by the constitution, each of them is bound, in the discharge of its duty to that constitution, to maintain and uphold. It may be, that in the discharge of that duty, they may take different views of the same matter, or of the extent of their respective jurisdictions, and that, in consequence, the judgments pronounced by them may be in conflict with each other. But this is no more than happens frequently, as every lawyer will tell you, between courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction, without its ever being dreamt of, that the one court, in vindicating its inherent jurisdiction against the encroachments of the other, is placing itself in an attitude of opposition to the law, or as my learned friend would express it, an attitude of collision to the state. In like manner, sir, it may be true that the judgments pronounced in one court, may indirectly affect rights that fall under the proper and exclusive jurisdiction of another court of co-ordinate jurisdiction, but every one, in the least degree conversant with such subjects, knows that this is a matter of frequent occurrence, without involving any such consequence, as that the one is bound to submit to the control of the other, within its own peculiar province, is under the sanction of being implicated in a charge of opposition to civil authority.

“My reverend friend, (Dr. Cook,) has assumed that the court of session is supreme in Scotland. I admit that it is supreme in matters of civil jurisdiction, but I deny that it is supreme in the sense which the reverend doctor’s argument involves. The constitution of Scotland recognizes several courts, all of which are supreme in their own departments, and none of which has any jurisdiction over the others. It recognizes the court of session as supreme in civil matters, subject always to appeal to the House of Lords, which, while sitting judicially in Scotch cases, is truly the supreme civil court of Scotland. But the court of session is not the only supreme court recognized by the constitution. It equally recognizes the court of justiciary, as supreme in criminal matters, the court of exchequer, as supreme in fiscal matters, and the courts of the established church, as supreme in spiritual matters. Each of these courts is supreme in its own peculiar province, and is not subject directly or indirectly to the control or jurisdiction of either of the others.

It frequently happens in practice, that these courts pronounce judgments which are inconsistent with, and contrary to those of another. But the remedy does not lie in the appeal from one of these courts to the other, but in each holding on in its own cause, to the effect of explicating the peculiar jurisdiction with which it is invested, irrespective of the judgments and decrees of the other.

“From the reverend doctor’s expression of surprise, this doctrine appears to be new to him. I scarcely think it can be so in reality. It is a point of law beyond the reach of dispute, and one which I am quite sure that none of my learned friends on the opposite side of the house, will venture to contest.

“For the sake of those who are not so conversant with these matters, I would illustrate the proposition by a simple case. A party brings an action in the court of session, to claim a legacy, on the faith of an alleged will, and the opposite party refuses to pay the legacy, on the ground that the will is not a genuine document, but a forgery, committed by the claimant. In order to determine the court point as to the legacy, the court must try the question of forgery. Suppose the court to pronounce a judgment, sustaining the deed as genuine, and virtually finding the prisoner not guilty of the forgery, and to adjudge the legacy to be paid accordingly. Notwithstanding such a judgment of the court of session, it would be perfectly competent for the public prosecutor to indict the same individual for forgery in the court of justiciary, and for the court of justiciary, if satisfied that he was guilty, to pronounce sentence of transportation, and, it may be, of death against him. Here then is a distinct contradiction between the judgments of those two courts. The one orders a legacy to be paid, on the ground of a deed being genuine, to an individual whom the other condemns to death, for having forged that very deed; and what is the consequence? Was it ever heard of that the court of session arrogated to itself the right to declare that the court of justiciary had done wrong? Or that the court of justiciary arrogated a right to declare that the court of session had done wrong? No lawyer will maintain such a proposition. And why? Simply because the one court is not subordinate to the other. No appeal lies from the one to the other. They are courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction. Suppose that the court of session were to intersect the court of justiciary from trying the accused, on the ground that they

had pronounced a judgment which virtually found him to be not guilty, would the court of justiciary regard the interdict? Unquestionably not. They would say, and say correctly, that whatever the court of session might do in regard to the civil rights of parties, the constitution had entrusted them, as the supreme criminal court of the country, with the administration of criminal justice, with which the court of session had nothing to do. The same would hold in the converse case of an attempt, on the part of the court of justiciary, to interfere with the jurisdiction of the court of session. The court of session would say, and say correctly, that the court of justiciary had nothing to do with questions of civil right; that the court of session was supreme in all such matters; that they were bound to exercise their own judgment; to explicate their own jurisdiction, with regard to the judgment of the court of justiciary. What then, it may be asked, would be the result of this? It is clear that both judgments, as to the matter of fact, cannot be right, because by the supposition the one is directly contrary to the other. If neither court is to control the other, who is to decide between them? I say, sir, without the risk of being contradicted by any lawyer in this house, that there is no court to decide between them, and yet that neither of them is bound to defer to the other. Each court is supreme, and it is presumed by the constitution, that the judgment of each is right. The result therefore is, that both judgments stand good, and will be given effect to—the judgment of the civil court to the effect of settling the civil rights that may be affected by the deed, and the court of justiciary to the effect of all penal consequences. In short, sir, I maintain, without the risk of contradiction, that in the case of courts co-ordinate, the principle of law, in case of conflicting judgments, is, that each proceeds to put in execution its own judgment, without regard to any judgment which may have been pronounced by the other. Nor does it in the least degree affect the matter, that the judgment in the one court may, in its consequences, affect the rights of the same, or some third person, which fall primarily under the jurisdiction of another court. It may happen, for example, that a sentence pronounced by the court of justiciary may materially affect the civil and patrimonial rights of either the individual who is the subject of the sentence, or of third parties, but no such collateral or incidental effect of a judgment not pronounced in the exercise of its lawful jurisdiction could give the civil court any right to control or interfere with it.



“Sir, if these principles are admitted, it humbly appears to me that they are conclusive of the question before the house. A conflict between the civil and spiritual courts is to be regulated by the same principles as a conflict between the civil and criminal courts. The analogy is perfect, and the inference irresistible, if they are courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction. That they are so must be admitted, if I can show that the constitution has invested the church courts with an exclusive jurisdiction in matters spiritual, and that the judgment in the Auchterarder case, refusing to induct Mr. Young, was pronounced in the exercise of that jurisdiction. But it is impossible to dispute either of these propositions. It is impossible to deny, that the constitution has entrusted the church courts with a final and exclusive jurisdiction in spiritual matters, and it seems equally impossible to deny that the ordination and induction of a minister is a spiritual matter. It does seem strange, sir, that any man should be called upon in our day, and in this General Assembly of the church of Scotland, for authority in support of either of their propositions, which have been received for three centuries, as axioms in our constitution. But so it is, and fortunately it is no difficult task to comply with the demand.”

The learned gentleman then proceeds to cite authorities from the statutes, but the above will serve as a specimen of the whole speech, which is luminous and conclusive in every part.

Dr. Chalmers could not but feel deeply interested in this cause, as through his motion and influence the *veto act* was adopted. And his concern was no doubt increased by the apprehension, that from the course pursued by the civil court, something disastrous might happen to the religious establishment of Scotland, which he conceives to be of vital importance to the church.

In his speech, already referred to, on occasion of offering his motion, he first states the part which he had taken six years before, in getting the *veto act* passed; speaks feelingly of the difficulty of the attitude into which the church was brought, by the confirmation of the decision of the court of session by the house of lords; but intimates, that he thought he could see an outlet to these perplexities. He mentions, that the views which he now entertained respecting the rights of patrons and of the people, had been familiar to his mind from the year 1819; and even three years before, he had proclaimed the same doctrine in the General Assembly, when the

two leaders Dr. Hill, and Dr. Nicol, lifted up their hands in astonishment, and declared, that for half a century, no such opinion had been heard within the walls of the supreme ecclesiastical court. He says, however, that at the time, his plan was not immediately to meddle with the relations between the patrons and parishes, but to go directly to parliament, and endeavour to obtain the passage of a law which would place this matter on its just foundation, and if this course which he then advocated, had been pursued, the church would have been saved from the unhappy collision with the civil courts which had taken place. "But," says he, "let it be distinctly understood, that when I recommended this, it was not for the purpose of obtaining the sanction of the state in favour of our own great constitutional principle of non-intrusion, for that I hold to be beyond their province;—neither for the purpose of superadding the civil and ecclesiastical sanction, in order to confer a rightful authority either on the veto law, or any other decrees by which to carry the principle of non-intrusion into effect; for that I hold to be equally beyond their province; but for the purpose of making sure that we did not forget that which it is altogether within the power and province of a government either to give or withhold the inestimable benefit of a national establishment—of making sure that we did not dis sever the temporalities from the living, a consequence fraught with disaster to the moral and religious interests of the people of Scotland. That was the only principle on which I can vindicate the advice then given; and my only regret is, that it was not taken. I now regret with all my heart, that my fears were overruled by the high legal authority of those whom I felt to be greatly more competent than myself for a judgment, on the effects of the step which was actually resolved upon. But better late than never. The very measure which I had advised, and which if consented to, would have prevented the blunder, I now advise over again, and that for the purpose of repairing it." He next attempts to remove the prejudice imbibed by the higher classes, both in England and Scotland, that this proceeding of the church was of a *radical* and rebellious character. He solemnly assures these classes, that this was not the fact; and declares, that there was not the slightest affinity between "the honest demand of the common people for a pure gospel, and those demands which are lifted up in the loud accents of turbulence and menace for the extension of their rights as citi-

zens. "There is," says he, "a total distinction and dissimilarity between these two things. Even an anti-patronage clergyman, let alone a vetoist, is just as unlike a chartist, or a radical, as William Wilberforce is unlike to William Cobbett."

The speaker next enters into an explanation of the nature of that dependence which the church has on the state; and deprecates the idea, that this subject has any thing to do with politics. Speaking still of the upper classes, whose prejudices he was labouring to obviate, he says, "They will find, in truth, that we have no politics at all, or rather no other than the safe, and the pacific, and the healthy politics of the New Testament—a code made up of five articles, the first of which is 'to fear God'—the second, 'to honour the king'—the third, 'to obey magistrates'—the fourth, 'meddle not with them that are given to change'—and the fifth, 'lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.'"

Dr. Chalmers makes it a special object, in his speech, to discourage a spirit of defiance towards the civil power, which some, under present circumstances, might be disposed to indulge. Indeed, his whole speech is of the most pacific and conciliatory character; but he nowhere manifests the least disposition to concede, in any degree, the principle asserted as belonging to the church in the Veto Act. So far from this, he defends the rights of the church and people in spiritual matters, with a power of reasoning which cannot be resisted; and happily elucidates the nature of the existing alliance between the church of Scotland and the civil government.

The latter part of this able speech is occupied with an examination of the opinions laid down, in the speeches of Lord Brougham, and the chancellor, before the House of Lords. And here he shows that these men, so learned in the law, were entirely mistaken in their views, both of the facts and law, as it related to the church of Scotland. He also answers the arguments of the Dean of Faculty, before the court of session.

Dr. Chalmers takes special pains to answer the objection derived from the appeal by the church to the House of Lords, involving an acknowledgment of the right of that court to divide the question. This he accomplishes in a very masterly manner. He also vindicates with much ability, the propriety of allowing the people a voice in the selection of



their own pastors. The Dean of Faculty had sneered at this proposition: but Dr. Chalmers defends it with conclusive arguments. "Now if there be one thing," says he, "of which we are more confident than another, it is, that here we have all philosophy on one side, and all that is sound in the experience of human nature. Not in Christianity alone, but in a thousand other subjects of human thought, there may be antipathies and approvals, resting on a most solid and legitimate foundation—not properly without reasons, but reasons deeply felt, yet incapable of being adequately communicated. And if there be one topic more than another, on which this phenomenon of the human spirit should be most frequently realized, it is the topic of Christianity—a religion, the manifestation of whose truth is unto the conscience; and the response, or assenting testimony to which, is an object of instant discernment, might issue from the deep recesses of their moral nature, on the part of whom, it is a felt reality—able therefore to articulate their belief, yet not able to articulate the reasons of it. There is much, and that the weightiest part by far, of the internal evidence for Christianity, that rests on the adaptations which obtain between its objective truths, and the felt necessities or desires of our subjective nature—adaptations powerfully and intimately felt by many a possessor of that nature, who is yet unable to propound them in language, far less to state and moderate them at the bar of judgment. And if the prerogatives of the human conscience were at one time more cruelly trampled upon than at another, it has been within the last century, and at the bar of this house,—when the collective mind of a congregation, who both knew and loved the truth as it is in Jesus, has been contemptuously set at naught, and the best, the holiest feelings of our Scottish patriarchs, by lordly oppressors sitting in judgment over them, were barbarously scorned. In that age of violent settlements, these simple, these unlettered men of a rustic congregation, would say no more, yet said truly of the intruded minister, that he did not preach the gospel, and that in the doctrine he gave, there was no food for the nourishment of their souls. I cannot imagine a more painful spectacle, than such men as these, the worthies of the olden time, at once the pride and preserving salt of our Scottish commonwealth, placed under the treatment and rough handling of an able, jeering, ungodly advocate, while coarse, and contemptuous clergymen, booted and spurred for riding

committees,\* were looking on and enjoying the scene; and a loud laugh from the seats of their assembled scorers, completed the triumph over the religious sensibilities of men, who could but reclaim with their hearts, and not with their voices. This was the policy of Dr. Robertson, recently lauded in high places,† a policy which has dissevered our population from our church, and shed most withering influence over the religion of the families of Scotland. Re-enact this policy if you will, and you place your kirk as a national establishment, on the brink of its sure annihilation. Have a care, ye professing friends of order and loyalty, have a care, lest by a departure from the line of resolute and unswerving principle, you strip the church of all moral weight in the eyes of the community. Think of the deadly enemies by whom we are surrounded, and have a care, lest by one hair-breadth of deviation from the path of integrity and honour, you cause the hearts of these Philistines to rejoice."

If it had been our object to present the arguments and authorities, which have been abundantly brought forward, on both sides of this case, we should have made large extracts from the learned pamphlet of the Rev. Andrew Gray, which is the first prefixed to this review; but our design was merely to exhibit to our readers a fair view of the nature of the case, and the proceedings of the civil and ecclesiastical courts in relation to it; for although frequently paragraphs have appeared in our papers on the subject, yet we are of opinion, that few persons in this country have understood the true nature of the difficulty which has arisen between the church and state in Scotland.

The speeches of the Rev. D. Burns, of Paisley, and of the Rev. Mr. Candlish, of St. George's, Edinburg, are animated, eloquent discourses, but we have not room to analyze them, nor is it necessary to our purpose, which was nothing more than to give a doctrinal and comprehensive view of this interesting case, the materials for which have been sufficiently supplied from the speeches of the eminent men already brought under review.

\* "Booted and spurred for riding committees." This relates to the committees of clergymen appointed by the General Assembly to ordain presentees, when the presbyteries of the place refused to do it.

† This relates to Lord Brougham's eulogy on Dr. Robertson, in the House of Lords. Dr. Robertson was the relative and patron of Brougham.

ART. V.—*A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language, containing the Accentuation—the Grammatical Inflections—the irregular words referred to their themes—the parallel terms from the other Gothic languages—the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon in English and Latin,—and copious English and Latin Indexes, serving as a Dictionary of English and Anglo-Saxon, as well as of Latin and Anglo-Saxon. With a Preface on the Origin and Connexion of the Germanic tongues—a Map of Languages, and the Essentials of Anglo-Saxon Grammar.* By the Rev. J. Bosworth, L. L. D. Dr. Phil. Leyden; B. D. of Trinity College, Cambridge, &c. &c. British Chaplain at Rotterdam. Royal 8vo. London, 1838. pp. 923.

WE give the whole of the copious title, as the most compendious way of indicating the contents of this valuable work; which must certainly be considered as marking a great advance in this walk of antiquarian philology. The study of the Anglo-Saxon tongue is yet in its infancy in America; and even in Great Britain, to the shame of its learned men, there has been so little use made of their facilities in this kind, that the most important researches have been ingloriously resigned to continental scholars: for it is scarcely needful to say, that there has been no Englishman, since the days of Junius, even if he is an exception, who can come into competition with Grimm and Rask.

There is one reason for this, however, which may serve as a partial apology. It is on the continent that the great boughs of the Teutonic tree still exist, while in England we have a scion cut away from the parent trunk, and deformed by numerous grafts from other stocks. Whatever may be thought of this, it will be apparent to every student, that the chief modern authorities, in this branch of comparative philology, are of the German and Scandinavian nations. It is from such sources that Dr. Bosworth has deduced some of his most useful matter, and by means of his seemingly familiar acquaintance with all the languages of which he speaks, he has produced a volume, which, though costly, is in our opinion a treasury of information to any one who would search into the wealth of the English tongue. The Preface alone, which fills more than two hundred pages, is fraught with the general and comparative literature of the Anglo-Saxon and its allied tongues, and with an amount of critical and bibliographical



learning, which, so far as we know, cannot be matched in any book in the English language. The author treats first of the importance of ethnography and comparative grammar, and endeavours to trace the affinities of language in their various ramifications. He then proceeds to consider the Germanic and Scandinavian languages, and the division into High and Low German. He dwells at length upon the Anglo-Saxon, and its sister tongue, the Friesic, concerning which he gives a rich and ingenious dissertation, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Halbertsma, himself a Friesian, and enthusiastically devoted to the honour of his country, and his vernacular dialect. The same course is pursued, with regard to the Old Saxons, the Hollanders, the Goths, the Alemanni or Suabians, the Franks, and the Scandinavians. These dissertations, for they are chiefly such, are valuable for the great number of specimens of all the languages and dialects which are mentioned; many of these being derived from rare books and manuscripts, which are altogether beyond the reach of the recluse scholar.

From the preliminary account of the Anglo-Saxon language, and of the manner in which it grew into the present English, we purpose to be large borrowers. There is no subject of greater interest to one who loves his mother-tongue, and there are few concerning which gross ignorance and extreme error are more rife. It has become very common for writers, who ought to know better, to speak concerning our language, about Saxon and Anglo-Saxon, in terms which plainly show that they are aware of no difference between the two, or between either and the English tongue. Before adducing any of Dr. Bosworth's facts, we distinctly acknowledge the extent of our obligation, especially as, wherever it is convenient, we shall use his very words.

The Anglo-Saxons are derived from the Angles, a tribe of the Saxon confederacy, occupying Anglen, in the south-east part of the duchy of Sleswig, in the south of Denmark. Their origin was oriental, but as they were as far westward as the Elbe, in the year 90, they were probably among the first of the Germanic tribes that visited Europe. By gradual increase, the Saxons came to possess the country within the Elbe, the Sala, and the Rhine, in addition to their former territory between the Elbe and the Eyder.

The principal tribes which entered Britain were the Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles. Of these the Jutes came first. Hengist and Horsa, two brothers from Jutland, arrived in three small ships in A. D. 449. For assisting the Britons

against the Picts, they had the Isle of Thanet assigned to them: they afterwards gained the Isle of Wight, Kent, and part of Hampshire. After the Jutes, must be mentioned the Saxons, who were called *Old Saxons*, to distinguish them from their kinsmen in Britain. The first Saxon kingdom was established by Ella, in A. D. 491, under the name of South-Saxons, or South-Sax, now Sussex. Another colony, under Cerdic, arrived in 519. These were the West-Saxons, (West-Seaxe,) occupying, at their widest extent, the north of Hampshire, Berks, Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and part of Cornwall. A third kingdom, in A. D. 527, was planted in Essex, Middlesex, and the south of Hertfordshire, under the name of East-Sax, or Essex. But besides the Jutes and the Saxons, were the Angles, as mentioned above. In A. D. 527, they settled themselves in East Anglia, containing Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, and part of Bedfordshire. The other Angle kingdoms were Bernicia, Deira, and Mercia, established in 547, 559, and 586, respectively. Thus, one Jute, three Saxon, and four Angle, altogether eight kingdoms, were established in Britain, by the year 586. "This state of Britain," says Turner in his History of the Anglo-Saxons, "has been improperly denominated the Saxon heptarchy. When all the kingdoms were settled, they formed an octarchy."

The Angles emigrated in a mass, so as to leave their original country uninhabited; they were accompanied by many of the Friesians. The term Anglo-Saxon denotes that the people so called, were the Angles, a nation coming from the Saxon confederacy. The country of their settlement came to be called Engla-land, or the Angles' land, now England.

Upon the full establishment of the Saxon tribes, the Britons were driven into Wales, and the Saxons began to contend among themselves. The West-Saxons gradually gained upon the others, till A. D. 327, when Egbert, King of Wessex, defeated, or made tributary all the other kingdoms. He and his successors had to contend with the Northmen, or Danes. The most successful of these kings was Alfred the Great, who drove out the Northmen. The literary turn of Alfred is well known. He translated into Anglo-Saxon, Boethius, Orosius, and Bede, and thus gave a pre-eminence to the West-Saxon language. There was a change of dynasty in A. D. 1016, when Canute, the Dane, came to the throne. The Saxon line was restored in 1042, and continued till the Norman conquest in 1066. But the Anglo-Saxon language

continued to be spoken till the time of Henry III. A. D. 1258. Dr. Bosworth thinks that what was written after this date may fairly be called English.

From this statement it will appear, that it was Alfred's patronage of the West-Saxon, which erected it into the court dialect, and basis of our speech. This is the pure Anglo-Saxon, and is found in the works of Alfred, Ælfric, the Anglo-Saxon laws, Cædmon, &c.

As a specimen, of easy comparison, we give the following from the parable of the Sower, in Marshall's Gospels:

Mk. iv. 3—8.

3. Gehyrath, Ute eode se saedere hys saed to sawenne.  
4. And tha he sew, sum feoll with thone weg, and fugelas comon and hyt fræton. 5. Sum feoll ofer stanscyligean, thar hyt næfde mycel eorþan, and sona up-eode, forþam the hyt næfde eorþan thicnesse. 6. Tha hyt up-eode, seo sunne hyt forswælde, and hyt forseranc, forþam hyt wirtruman næfde. 7. And sum feoll on thornas, tha stigon tha thornas and forthrysmodon thæt, and hyt wæstm ne bær. 8. And sum feoll on god land, and hyt sealde, upstigende and wexende, wæstm, and an brohte thrittig-fealdne, sum syxtigfealdne, sum hundfealdne.

It is probable that the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons, were not without some differences of dialect when they arrived. But the Jutes were few in number, and the influence of their language must have been small. The dialect of the Angles, which was formerly called the Dano-Saxon dialect, was harsher and harder than the West-Saxon. Specimens of these several dialects are given in the work before us. Instead of these, however, we will introduce specimens of the Lord's Prayer, from the Mithridates of Adelung:

1. Anglo-Saxon of King Alfred, A. D. 875.

“Fæder ure, thu the earth on Heofenum,  
Si thin Nama gehalgod;  
To be cume thin Rice;  
Gewurthe thin Willa on Eorþan swa swa on Heofnum;  
Urne ge dāghwanlican Hlaf syle us to dæg;  
And forgyf us ure Gyltas, swa swa we forgyfath urum Gyltendum;  
And ne gelādde thu us on Costnung;  
Ac alyse us of Yfle.”



2. Dano-Saxon, of Aldred, A. D. 889.

“Fader uren, thu arth in Heofnum,  
Si gehalgud Noma thin;  
To cymeth Ric thin;  
Sie Willo thin suae is in Heofne and in Eortha;  
Hlaf usenne of wistlic sel us to Dæg;  
And fergef us Scylda usna, suä ue fergefon Scyldgum usum;  
And ne inläd usih in Costunge;  
Uh gefrig usich from Yfle.”

3. Probably the same in a different dialect.

“Uren Fader thie arth in Heofnas,  
Sie gehalgud thin Noma;  
To cymeth thin Ryc;  
Sie thin Willa sue is in Heofnas, and in Eortho;  
Uren Hlaf ofer wittlic sel us to Dæg;  
And forgef us Scylda urna, sue we forgefän Scyldgum urum;  
And no inläd usih in Custnung;  
Ah gefrig usih from Ifle.”

4. Dano-Saxon, of A. D. 900.

“Thu ure Fäder, the eart on Heofenum,  
Si thin Nama gehalgod;  
Cume thin Rice;  
Si thin Willa on Eortha, swa swa on Heofonum;  
Syle us to Dæg urne dāghwanlican Hlaf;  
And forgif us ure Gyltas, swa swa we forgifath tham the  
with us agyltath;  
And ne lād thu na us on Costnunge;  
Ac alys us fram Yfele. Sih it swa.”

5. Probably of the same date.

“Fäder ure, thu the in Heofunum,  
Beo gehalgud thin Noma;  
Cume to thine Rice;  
Weorthe thin Willa swa swa on Hoefune, swile on Eorthe;  
Hlaf userne dāghwamlicu sel us so Dæg;  
And forlete us ure Scylde, swa swa we ec forleten thäm the  
scyldigat with us;  
And ne gelät us geleade in Costnungä;  
Ah gelese us of Yfle.”

6. Dano-Saxon, from Marshall's Gospels.

“Fäder ure, thu the eart on Heofenum,  
Si thin Nama gehalgod;

To-becume thin Rice;  
 Gewurthe thin Willa on Eorþan swa swa on Heofenum;  
 Urne daghwamlican Hlaf syle us to Dæg;  
 And forgyf us ure Gyltas, swa swa we forgyfath urum Gyl-  
 tendum;  
 And ne gelädde thu us on Costnunge;  
 Ac alys us of Yfele. Sothlike."

7. Anglo-Saxon or English of 1160.

"Ure Fäder, thu the on Heofene eart,  
 Syo thin Name gohaleged;  
 To cume thin Rice;  
 Geworde thin Wille on Heofene and on Eorthe;  
 Syle us to Daig urne daighwamliche Hlaf;  
 And forgyf us ure Geltes, swa we forgyfath aelcen thare the  
 with us agylteth;  
 And ne läd thu us on Costnunge;  
 Ac alys us fram Yfele."

8. English of the 13th century.

"Oure Fader, that art in Hevenes,  
 Halewid be thi Name;  
 Thy Kingdom come;  
 To be thi Wille do as in Hevene and in Erthe;  
 Gyff to us this Day oure Brede over other Substance;  
 And forgyve to us our Dettis, as forgyven to oure Dettours;  
 And lede us not into Temptatioun;  
 But delyeve us fro Yvel. Amen, that is, so beit."

9. English of 1370.

"Our Fadyr, that art in Hevenes,  
 Halloed be thy Name;  
 Thy Kingdom come to;  
 Be thy Will done in Ertne as in Hevene;  
 Geve to us this Day our Bread, over other Substance;  
 And forgif to us our Dettis, as we forgyven to our Detters;  
 And leed us not into Temptation;  
 But deliver us from Evil. Amen."

10. English of 1430.

"Oure Fadir, that art in Hevenes,  
 Halewid be thi Name;  
 Thi Kingdom come to thee;  
 Be thi Will don in Eerthe as in Hevene;  
 Give to us this Day oure Breed over othre Substance;

And forgive to us oure Dettis, as we forgiven oure Dettours;  
 And lede us not into Temptation;  
 But deliver us from Ivel. Amen."

11. English of Tindal's Version, 1526.

"Our Father, which art in Heven,  
 Halowed be thy Name;  
 Let thy Kingdom come;  
 Thy Will be fullfilled as well in Earth, as it is in Heven;  
 Geve us this Daye our dayly Bred;  
 And forgeve as oure Dettis, as we forgiven oure Detters;  
 And leade us not into Temptation;  
 But deliver us from Evyll.  
 For thyne is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glorye  
 for ever."

Dr. Bosworth thinks it evident that the pure West Saxon did not ever prevail over the whole of England, and that in process of time the language approached more or less to the present English according to its relative position to the West-Saxons. "The difference observable in the language of the most cultivated classes would be still more marked and apparent in the mass of population, or the less educated community. These, from their agricultural pursuits, had little communication with the inhabitants of other provinces; and having few opportunities and little inducement to leave their own neighbourhood, they intermarried among each other, and, from their limited acquaintance and circumscribed views, they would naturally be much attached to their old manners, customs, and language. The same cause operating from age to age would keep united the greater part of the population, or the families of the middle stations of life, it may therefore be well expected that much of the peculiarity of dialect prevailing in Anglo-Saxon times, is preserved even in the present day in the provincial dialects of the same districts. In these local dialects, then, remnants of the Anglo-Saxon tongue may be found in its least altered, most incorrupt, and therefore its purest state. Having a strong and expressive language of their own, they had little desire and few opportunities to adopt foreign idioms or pronunciation, and thus to corrupt the purity of their ancient language. Our present polished phrase and fashionable pronunciation are often new, and, as deviating from primitive usage, faulty and corrupt. We are therefore much indebted to those patriotic individuals, who have referred us to the archaisms of our nervous



language, by publishing provincial glossaries, and giving specimens of their dialects." No less than fourteen works of this kind are named by our author. From these much very interesting information might be derived, with regard to the variations of the English tongue. English travellers complain, no doubt, with some justice, of a tendency in American English to diverge from the original language, and to become a great provincial dialect. Yet this is nothing when compared with the dialects of England itself, in every part of which the lower class of people speak in a manner scarcely intelligible beyond their own region. The following specimen will illustrate this subject more fully than any abstract remarks: it is part of the same dialogue, given first in the Somerset and then in the Derbyshire dialect:

*Somersetshire.*

*Farmer Bennet.* Jan! why dwon't ye right my shoes?

*Jan Lide.* Bin, maester 'tis zaw cawld, I can't work wi' tha tacker at all; I've a brawk it ten times I'm shower to dâ—da vreeze za hord; an I can't avoord ta keep a good vier—I wish I cood—I'd zoon right your shoes an withers too—I'd zoon yarn zum money, I warnt ye. Can't ye vine zum work vor me, maester, theäze hord times—I'll do any theng ta sar a penny. I can drash—I can cleave brans—I can make spars—I can thatchy—I can shear ditch, an I can gripy too, bit da vreeze za hord. I can wimmy—I can messy or milky nif ther be need o't. I ood'n mine dreavin plough or any theng.

*Farmer Bennet.* I've a got nothin vor ye ta do, Jan; bit Mister Boord bane hond ta I jist now that thâ war gwain ta wimmy, and that thâ wanted zumbody ta help 'em.

*Derbyshire.*

*Farmer Bennet.* Tummus, why dunner yo mend mek shoon?

*Tummus Lide.* Becoz, mester, 'tis zo cood, I conner work wee the tachin at aw; I've brockn it ten times I'm shur to de—it freezes zo hard. I conner afford to keep a good fire—I wish I cud—I'd soon mend yore shoon, an uthers tow.—I'd soon yarn sum money, I warrant ye. Conner ye find some work for m', mester, these hard times?—I'll do onny think to addle a penny. I con thresh,—I con split wood—I con make spars—I con thack. I con skower a dike, and I con trench tow, bur it freeze zo hard. I con winner—I con

fother, or milk, if there be need on't. I woodner mind dri-  
vin plow, or onny think.

*Farmer B.* I hanner got nothin for ye to do, Tum-  
mus, bur Mester Boord tow'd me jist now that they wor goo-  
in to winner, an that they shud want somebody to help 'em.

Among these dialects we find the origin of many vulgar  
provinciallisms in American pronunciation, particularly of  
such as characterize certain parts of New England. Thus  
in Norfolk we have *warnt* for were not, in Lancashire, *aw-  
lus* for always, *keaw* for cow, *heawse* for house. In the Ex-  
moor dialect, *arter* for after; in Derbyshire *nation* for very,  
or very great, *summet* for somewhat.

Mr. Halbertsma, a native Friesian, gives the following re-  
markable testimony respecting the provincial dialects of his  
native tongue. "Among a people so fond of liberty as the  
Angles and Friesians, not only every district, but every vil-  
lage, nay every hamlet, must have a dialect of its own." "At  
this very time, those living on the coast of *Eastmahorn* in  
Friesia, do not understand the people of *Schiermonikoog*, a  
little island with one village of the same name, almost in  
sight of the coast." "It is now," Mr. H. continues, "six-  
teen years since I spoke to an old woman at *Molquerum*, a  
village now almost lying in ruins, but still divided into seven  
little islands, called *Pollen*, joined to each other by little  
bridges. Now the good woman told me in her homely style,  
that when she was a child, every island had its peculiar way  
of pronouncing, and that when an inhabitant of any of the  
villages entered her mother's house, she could ascertain to  
which *Pol* the person belonged, merely by some peculiarity  
of speech. Dependence may be placed on this fact, as I have  
ascertained its truth by strict inquiry."

As there is no country in the world more free from these  
inconveniences than our own, we shall add for the entertain-  
ment of our readers seventeen specimens of the following  
verse, in as many different German dialects: Math iv. 3. 4.  
*Hearken; behold there went out a Sower to sow; and it  
came pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way-side, and  
the fowls of the air came and devoured it up.*

#### 1. *Luther's Bible, 1545.*

Höret zu! Sihe, es gieng ein Seeman aus zu seen. Vnd  
es begab sich, in dem er seet, fiel etlichs and den Weg, da  
kamen die Vogel unter dem Himel vnd frassens auff.

## HIGH-GERMAN DIALECTS IN 1827.

2. *Canton Zurich.*

Losät uf, äs ischt en Ackhersma uffs Fäld gangä ge säen.  
Und da er gsät hät, ischt öbbis a d' Strass gfallä, da sind d'  
Vögel cho und händs ufrässä.

3. *Canton Uri.*

Hört zuo, ksöscht, a Man isscht ussganga go säia; und wie  
'ne sait, falt'n öpis an die Strass, da sind die Vögel cho, und  
hand's aweg gefrassa.

4. *Suabian, near the Alps.*

Losat und luogad, as ischt a Sayer ussi ganga z'säud; und  
wie ear g'sait heat, ischt a Doal uf a Weag, g'falla, den henn-  
da d' Vögel g'noh' und ufg'freassa.

5. *Alsacian, about Strasburg.*

Hert, siet der Ackersmann esch üssgange zu'm Saije; Un  
wie er g'saijit hätt, esch eins ouf de Waij g'falle; da sind d'  
Vögel komme ounterm Himmel, un häns ouffg'frässe.

6. *Salzburg.*

Höscht's : Schau, ös gang a Samon aus zum San: Und  
ös gab si, indem a sat, völd a Doal an dem Wög, da kaman d'  
Vögl und frass'ns auf.

7. *Bavarian, about Munich.*

Lossts enk sogn! a Moi is a Baur aufs Sahn' naus ganga.  
Und wia r-a denn do g'saht hot, is e'am a Thoai Samma-r-ann  
Weg no gfoin; do sann d'Vögl vonn Himmi ro kemma, und  
hammatn aufg'frössn.

8. *Frankfort on Maine.*

Hihrt zou, Sich, es gung e Mol a Sihmann enausser z'sihn.  
Unn do hot sech's begäwwe, wäi er gesiht hot, fäil Epas  
d'ryun an'n Wäg: do senn di Vigol unnerm Hemmel kum-  
me, unn hawwe's uffgefrosse.

9. *Hessian, about Kassel.*

Hehrt zu, sich, es gink en Sehmann us ze sehen. Un es  
begab sich, wie hä sehte, fiel etliches uf den Wäk; do kamen  
de Väggl unner dem Himmel und frassens uf.



10. *High-Saxon, about Leipsic.*

Hurt zu säht! 's gung ä mal a Siaemann aus zu Siaen. Un da hä siaete, da feel eeniges an'n Wäg: da kamen de Vogel ungger'n Himmel, un frassens uf.

11. *High-Saxon, about Ansbach.*

Härt zu! sieh, es gieng a Soama auf 's Soâ aus. Und es iss g'sehegn, indemm ehr säte, fiel etlichs an den Weeg. Doa kamm die Viegel unt'rn Himmel und frassens auf.

## LOW-GERMAN DIALECTS.

12. *Nienburg.*

Hört to : Seeth en Seyer günk ut to seyen. Un et begaf sick, unner't Seyen vull etlick an de Wech, do kemen de Vägels unner'n Himmel un fretent up.

13. *Platt-Deutsch, about Hanover.*

Härt tau, et gunk ein Sägemann ut, tau sägen. Und et begaf seck, weil hei sögte, fellen edliche Kören en den Weg; da keimen dei Vögeln under dem Himmel und fratten sei up.

14. *Platt-Deutsch of Brandenburg.*

Horch tau, et gink en Buer up't Feld tum Seen. Un et begaf sick, indem he seete, föhl wat an der Side (oder: ob de Halve); da kamen de Vögel von Himmel (oder; von boben) und fratent up.

15. *Hamburg.*

Hör't to: Een Bahr güng ut sien Saat to sayn: As he nu say't, full een Deel von de Saat by den Wegg, un wurr von de Vägel unnern Himmel oppfreten.

16. *Brunswick.*

Höret tau! Süh et gung en Saiemann ut to saien, Un et begaf sik; bi den Saien, fell wat an den Weg; do kaimen de Vöggel under den Himmel un freiten et up.

17. *Mecklenburg-Schwerin.*

Hüret to: Sü, dar gink een Sajer uut, to sajen. Un et begav sik, as he sajete, feel week (wat) an de Straat, dar kemen de Vägel unner den Hewen, un freten't upp.

It will be evident upon even a cursory inspection of these specimens, which are culled from a much greater number, that the Low German is much nearer to the English than the other, and predominant dialect. This might be expected, as it is, with unimportant alterations, the Old Saxon tongue. The Low-German and Dutch proverbs are nearly all the same, both equally expressive, and in phraseology like the English.

As dat beer is in den man,  
Is de wyshet in de kan.

As (*when*) the beer is in the man  
The wisdom is in the can.

In the examples of Low-German given above, within the compass of two very short verses, we have the following English words, exactly, viz: *To, Up, Fell, Under, He, Side, By, Wurr* (were,) *As*; and the following nearly, viz: *Seeth*, see; *Weil*, while; *Weg*, way; *Horch*, hark; *Feld*, field; *Buer*, boor; *Boben*, above; *Ut*, out; *Hewen*, heaven; *Straat*, street; *Saat*, seed, &c.

The remarks of Mr. Halbertsma on this subject are valuable, for though he writes in English, and with great correctness, he possesses as a Hollander advantages for some parts of this comparison, such as have been enjoyed by few writers. "Low-Saxon," says he, "has all the appearance of German grafted on an Anglo-Friesic tree. The words are Anglo-Friesic, with German vowels, as if the Friesians, in adopting the German, retained the consonants of the old language. This observation may, with still greater propriety, be applied to the syntax and phraseology, that is, to the mental part or soul of the language. They continued to think in Anglo-Friesic forms, while their organs adopted the vowels and some other mechanical parts of the German. Hence there is scarcely a single expression or phrase extant in Anglo-Saxon, Friesic, or Dutch, of which the parallel may not be found in the Low-Saxon glossaries." According to the same authority, the proper Friesians, or those who are surrounded on the north, west, and south, by the Zuiderzee, continue to speak a dialect which is strikingly like the Anglo-Saxon. "I cannot omit to mention," he adds, "that the leaders of the Anglo-Saxons bear names which are now in use by the Friesians, though by time a little altered or abbreviated. They have *Hortse, Hengst, Witte, Wiggele, Eske, Tsjisse, Tsjerk, Ealse, Hessel*; for the Anglo-Saxon *Horsa, Hengest, Witta, Wihtgil*." There are indeed but few An-

glo-Saxon names which may not be found in use among the present Friesians.

But we must desist from minute observations of this kind, however strong the temptation, in order to accomplish what is the principal purpose of these remarks; for we have undertaken them in the hope of stimulating some of our younger philologists to the study of our own language in its remote sources. It is amusing to hear and read the remarks which often come under our notice, from persons who while their dialect abounds with every provincialism and vulgarity which is embalmed in Webster's indiscriminate collection, still prate about Saxon, and pure Saxon, as if they knew what the words meant. Separated by an ocean from the ancient seats of our vernacular tongue, and exposed to the breaking in of a mingled flood from other languages, we cannot expect our English to continue long in its purity. When charged with this, we have too often been satisfied with stout denials, instead of trying to prevent the evil. Every year however the denial must become less and less easy. While we protest against the spirit of the passage from which the following remarks are taken, we cannot but admit the force of the remarks themselves: "Far severed from the original spring of English undefiled, the Americans always run the risk of sinking into provincialisms, into Patavinity, both positive, in the use of obsolete words, and the adoption of conventional village significations, which differ from those retained by us, —as well as negative, in the omission of those happy expressions which bear the fire-new stamp of the only authorized mint." We take it as a point granted, among all American scholars, that the erection of a separate dialect here, and the consequent segregation of our language and letters from that of the mother country, is an unqualified evil, to be forever deprecated, as baleful to our learning, as well as our Christian enterprise. Yet this is an evil to which some of our first scholars are hourly contributing, by their neglect of pure English authority, by their hasty patronage of big words from the Latin stock, usually coined by newspaper editors and second-rate speakers; and, last but not least, by the wanton adoption of novelties in orthography, which already distinguish at a glance almost all New England publications, and which, if they proceed, must in the course of time render a book from America disgusting to a British eye. The question is, not so much whether these changes are right or wrong, as whether it is expedient for us to set up a new or-



thography for ourselves, towards the adoption of which there is no tendency in Great Britain. We cannot but express our sincere regret that the American Tract Society, whose publications have so wide a circulation and influence, should have lent themselves to propagate the novel, and in a number of instances, absurd and ludicrous orthography of Webster's Dictionary, especially as the more refined scholars, even in Boston, and all except newspaper editors south of New York, adhere to those formulas of spelling, which occur in the first British publications, as for example, the Quarterly and Edinburgh Reviews.

One of the most important barriers against the flood which threatens our language, is the study of the Anglo-Saxon. The changes which have been wrought in English, by the adoption of words from the Latin or the French, while they add to the copiousness of the language, go to destroy its expressiveness and force. In almost every case where a foreign synonym has been introduced, some fine old English word has fallen into partial or entire disuse. "The facility and simplicity of combining several short indigenous words, to express any complex idea, practised by the Anglo-Saxons and other Gothic nations, is now," says Dr. Bosworth, "too seldom used. Instead of adopting technical terms from other languages, or forming them from the Greek or Latin, as is the present English custom, our Anglo-Saxon forefathers formed words equally expressive, by composing them from their own radical terms. For our *literature*, they used *boc-cræft*, *book-craft*, from *boc*, a *book*, *cræft*, *art*, science; for *arithmetic*, *rimcræft*, from *rim*, a *number*, *cræft*, *art*." Let us also hear the judgment of a learned foreigner; "If the syntax of the Anglo-Saxon," says Halbertsma, "be the basis of the English Syntax, as I think it is, notwithstanding a partial degeneracy, since the Norman conquest, by a mixture with French, the absurdity is felt of modelling the construction of the English according to that of corrupt Latin, known by the name of French. The construction of the French language is as regularly arranged as the pipes of an organ, while the most diversified inversion, exceeded only by that of the Latin and Greek, characterizes the Anglo-Saxon and Friesic; and the more the English is made to differ from this standard of propriety, the more it deviates from its original form and its very nature." Even though we borrow from a better language, we do not always improve, for, as Dr. Campbell observes, a mixture of two liquors is often worse than

either. The Romans corrupted the Augustan purity of their tongue by borrowing from the Greek, while the long continued energy of the Greek language, was owing mainly to its rejection of all words but its own. And while we are laboriously bringing in difficult polysyllables from the Latin, the Dutch and Germans are emulating the Greeks, by carefully weeding out hundreds of words which had crept in from the classic tongues, and substituting compounds from the stores of their native Saxon.

Viewing our language as it now stands, we may observe that the great foundation of it is Teutonic. Almost all the verbs, particles, and other words which constitute the body, the frame work of our discourse, are Saxon. Being more the language of the field and the fireside, they come home to our business and bosoms. While juvenile and late-learned writers are enamoured of sesquipedalian terms of Roman origin, our best authors and orators, our Websters and Southards and Irvings know the power of the racy Saxon roots. To this treasury they resort, as we must all do, for tender, gentle, comprehensive, as well as picturesque and powerful words. Turner, in his History of the Anglo-Saxons, has shown how many of our words are thus derived, by giving passages of the most eminent writers, both in poetry and prose, of different ages, with the words of Saxon origin printed in italics. Our learned fellow-citizen, Mr. Duponceau, says, "So far as we are able to judge, from a superficial investigation of the subject, we are apt to believe that the English words of northern derivation, are to those derived from the ancient as well as the modern languages of Southern Europe, in the proportion of something more than *three*, but not quite as much as *four to one*." An estimate somewhat different, is made by Halbertsma. "My object," says he, "was to show the analogy between the two languages, (Friesic and English,) by translating them as literally as possible; and the cognate words in English, which do not perfectly agree with the Friesic in sense, I have explained by others in parenthesis. In 1200 words I have only had recourse to fifty, which are not of Saxon origin—a number which might be greatly diminished by a scholar, thoroughly acquainted with the original stores of the English language. At this rate, about every twenty-fourth word of the original fund of the language is lost. In one hundred and twenty-five words in parenthesis, I used fifty foreign words: here one word is lost out of every two and a half. The number of words

was twelve hundred; add the words in parentheses, one hundred and twenty-five, it makes a total of thirteen hundred and twenty five. The foreign words in twelve hundred were fifty, and in parentheses fifty, making the sum of one hundred. Then thirteen hundred and twenty-five divided by one hundred, gives thirteen and a quarter, which shows that there is one foreign word for every thirteen English." The only remark which need be added, is that the passages by Halbertsma, as the subject of his investigation, were constructed on the plan of avoiding Latin terms in every possible case.

Every careful student of English literature has observed that if there exist two synonymous words, one of Latin and the other of Saxon origin, the former is generally more expressive and poetical, and especially more available for reaching the common mind: for example, *fatherly*, *motherly*, *brotherly*, and paternal, maternal, fraternal; *happiness*, and felicity; *faithfulness* and fidelity; *kindred* and relation; *witchcraft*, necromancy; *burst*, rapture; *strength*, vigour; *storm*, tempest; *tearful*, lackrymose; *offering*, oblation; *mirth*, hilarity; *heartly*, cordial; *dwell*, lodge; *bereave*, deprive. In Shakspeare, and in the English version of the Bible, some of the most striking and tender passages owe these qualities, in a great degree, to the predominance of the Saxon element, and if the experiment be made of exchanging these for words of Roman or Latin derivation, the thoughts will be disparaged.

On such a topic, the judgment of so great a scholar as Mackintosh will carry weight. "From the Anglo-Saxon," says he, "we derive the names of most of the ancient officers among us; of the greater part of the divisions of the kingdom, and of almost all our towns and villages. From them also we derive our language, of which the structure and a majority of its words, much greater than those who have not thought on the subject, would at first easily believe, are Saxon. Of sixty-nine words which make up the Lord's Prayer, there are only five not Saxon;—the best example of the natural bent of our language, and of the words apt to be chosen by those who speak and write it without design. Of eighty-one words in the soliloquy of Hamlet, thirteen only are of Latin origin. Even in a passage of ninety words in Milton, whose diction is more learned than that of any other poet, there are only sixteen Latin words. In four verses of the authorized translation of Genesis, which con-



tains above one hundred and thirty words, there are no more than five Latin. In seventy-nine words of Addison, whose perfect taste preserved him from a pedantic or constrained preference for any portion of the language, we find only fifteen Latin. In later times, the language rebelled against the bad taste of those otherwise vigorous writers, who, instead of ennobling their style, like Milton, by the position and combination of words, have tried to raise it by unusual and far-fetched expressions. Dr. Johnson, himself, from whose corruptions English style is only recovering, in eighty-seven words of his fine parallel between Dryden and Pope, has found means to introduce no more than twenty-one of Latin derivation. The language of familiar intercourse, the terms of jest and pleasantry, and those of necessary business, the idioms and peculiar phrases into which words naturally run; the proverbs, which are the condensed and pointed sense of the people; the particles, on which our syntax depends, and which are of perpetual recurrence;—all these foundations of a language are more decisive proofs of the Saxon origin of ours, than even the great majority of Saxon words in writing, and the still greater majority in speaking. In all cases where we have preserved a whole family of words, the superior significancy of a Saxon over a Latin term is most remarkable. *Well-being arises from well-doing*, is a Saxon phrase, which may be thus rendered into the Latin part of the language:—*Felicity attends Virtue*; but how inferior in force is the latter! In the Saxon phrase, the parts or roots of words being significant in our language, and familiar to our eyes and ears, throw their whole meaning into the compounds and derivations; while the Latin words of the same import, having their roots and elements in a foreign language, carry only a cold and conventional signification to an English ear."

To this we may add the opinion of one of the most harmonious and eloquent of modern English writers, the late Robert Hall. His biographer thus writes: "In one of my early interviews with Mr. Hall, I used the word *felicity* three or four times, in rather quick succession. He asked 'Why do you say *felicity*, sir? *Happiness* is a better word, more musical and genuine English, coming from the Saxon.' 'Not more musical, I think, sir.' 'Yes, more musical, and so are words derived from the Saxon generally. Listen sir: *My heart is smitten and withered like grass*; there's plaintive music. Listen again, sir: *Under the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice*. There's cheerful music.' 'Yes, but *rejoice*

is French?" True, but all the rest is Saxon, and rejoice is almost out of tune with the other words. Listen again: *Thou hast delivered my eyes from tears, my soul from death, and my feet from falling*; all Saxon, sir, except *delivered*. Then, sir, for another specimen, and almost all good old Saxon English: *Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.*"

At the time of the Reformation, and during most of the sixteenth century, we observe in English writers a marked predominance of the Saxon ingredient, which make the writers of that age peculiarly charming. The next age brought in many Latin and French words, so that the diction of that day was marred by an appearance of pedantry. This was especially the case in some writings of the time of Charles the Second. In the reign of Queen Anne, there was a return to the dignified purity of genuine English. The influence, however, of such writers as Johnson and Gibbon, tended to burden and corrupt our language, by needless importations from abroad. Of the latter, Hannah More said well, that if Gibbon had his will, the Christian religion and the English language would come to an end together. And at the present day, the wanton introduction of scientific terms from the Greek and Latin, and of phrases from the French, threatens to render our tongue still more piebald, heterogeneous and unwieldy. Still it may be observed in the citations just made, the suffrage of the most accomplished scholars, and eloquent writers, is wholly in favour of Saxon English. In our own country, indeed, the rage for what is sounding, pompous, swelling, and uncommon, leads our writers and speakers to deal much in words of Latin origin. In this respect the writers of our revolutionary period far surpass us. The English of Franklin, Adams, and Ames, is more chaste than that of our own day. Those, moreover, who most variegate their diction with uncommon, difficult, and polysyllabic phrases, are such as have come late and irregularly into the field of letters, and have least real acquaintance with the models of classical taste; just as we observe the greatest display of paste-diamonds and jeweller's gold upon those whose wealth and credit are somewhat disputable. Still the current is evidently setting back in favour of pure English, and in proportion to the demand for this, will be the avidity of scholars for the pristine literature of England. We hope to see, before many years, an allotment of time to Anglo-

Saxon in every college in America; and in preparation for this, we earnestly wish that some of our learned men would prepare suitable elementary books for publication. We know of no way in which we can so effectually aid the young Anglo-Saxon student, as by adding the bibliographical notices which follow.

“A CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE CHIEF WORKS PRINTED IN ANGLO-SAXON, WITH A NOTICE OF GRAMMARS AND DICTIONARIES INTENDED FOR JUNIOR STUDENTS.—[1567.] *ÆLFRIC*. 1. A Testimonie of Antiquitie showing the auncient fayth in the Church of England, touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord here publicly preached, and also receiued in the Saxon's tyme, above 600 yeares agoe, 16mo. Imprinted at London by John Daye, dwelling over Aldersgate beneath S. Martyns, 1567. *This little book contains “A Sermon of the Paschall Lambe to be spoken unto the people at Easter.” Anglo-Saxon on the left-hand page and an English translation on the right. It is paged only on the right to 75. Then follow 13 leaves without being paged, containing the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the X Commandments in Saxon, with an interlinear English translation. The whole book, therefore, consists of 88 leaves, or 176 pages. It was published again in small 4to. with L' Isle's ‘Treatise concerning [the Old and New Testament,’ in 1623; the Easter Homily was printed again in the 2d vol. of Fox's ‘Acts and Monuments,’ and in the notes to Whelock's ‘Bede,’ b. v. c. 22. In the year of L' Isle's death, it appeared again with this title, “Divers ancient Monuments in the Saxon Tongue,” &c. 4to. 1638.—*[1568.] *LAWs*. 2. *Ἀρχαιονομία*, sive de priscis Anglorum Legibus libri, Sermone Anglico, vetustate antiquissimo aliquot abhinc seculis conscripti, atque nunc demum magno Jurisperitorum et amantium antiquitatis omnium commodo, e tenebris in lucem vocati, Gulielmo Lambardo, 4to. ex officina Johan. Daye, Lond. 1568. *A greatly improved edition was published by Whelock, in folio, Cambridge, 1644, pp. 226, 1l. A still better edition, so much enlarged and improved as to be considered almost a new work, was published with the following title: “Leges Anglo-Saxonicæ Ecclesiasticæ et Civiles, accedunt Leges Edvardi Latinæ, Gulielmi Conquestoris Gallo-Normannicæ, et Henrici I. Latinæ, subjungitur Domini Henr. Spelmanni Codex Legum Veterum Statutorum Regni Angliæ, quæ ab ingressu Guliel-*



mi I. usque ad annum nonum Henr. III. edita sunt; toti Operi præmittitur Dissertatio Epistolaris admodum Reverendi Domini Gulielmi Nicolsoni Episcopi, Derrensis De Jure Feudali Veterum Saxonum, cum Codd. MSS. contulit, notas, versionem, et glossarium adjecit David Wilkens, S. T. P. fol. Lond. 1721, p. 234, 2l. 12s. 6d. *These are in Anglo-Saxon, with Latin translation and notes.*—Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen. In der Ursprache mit Uebersetzung und Erläuterungen herausgegeben von Dr. Reinhold Schmid, Professor der Rechte zu Jena, 8vo. Leipzig, 1832, pp. 304, about 8s. *There are two columns in a page; on the left is the Anglo-Saxon text, in Roman type, and on the right a German translation. The second volume has long been expected. The Record Commission have undertaken an edition with an improved Anglo-Saxon text, carefully accented, and accompanied with an English translation and notes. It was prepared, and a considerable part printed, under the superintendence of the late Richard Price, Esq. whose critical acquaintance with the Anglo-Saxon has been manifested by his excellent edition of Warton's "History of English Poetry." This edition of the A.-S. Laws by Mr. Price, is not yet published.*—[1571.] GOSPELS. 3. The Gospels of the fower Euangelists, translated in the olde Saxon tyme, out of Latin into the vulgare tounge of the Saxons, newly collected out of auncient monumentes of the said Saxons, and now published for testimonie of the same, 4to. London, printed by John Daye, 1571. *It is accompanied with an English version out of the Bishop's Bible, so altered as to agree with the Saxon, and published by Fox, the Martyrologist at the expense of Archbishop Parker. Price 3l. 3s.*—Quatuor D.N. Jesu Christi Evangeliorum Versiones per antiquæ duæ, Gothica scil. et Anglo-Saxonica: quarum illam ex celeberrimo Codice Argenteo nunc primum depromsit Franciscus Junius, hanc autem ex Codd. MSS. collatis emendatiùs recudi curavit Thomas Mareschallus Anglus; cujus etiam observationes in utramque versionem subnectuntur. Accessit et Glossarium Gothicum: cui præmittitur Alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum, &c. operâ ejusdem Francisci Junii, 4to. Dordrecht, 1665, et Amsterdam, 1684, p. 383—431, 2l. 8s. *The Amsterdam edition appears, on collation, to be made up from the old copies with new title-pages, and a re-print of the first sheet in vol. ii. Moes. Glos.* The Anglo-Saxon Gospels from the text of Marshall, the Rushworth Gloss, MS. Bodl. together

with all the A.-S. translations of the Gospels, are about to appear in a quarto volume from the Pitt Press, Cambridge. —[1623.] **ÆLFRIC.** 4. A Saxon Treatise concerning the Old and New Testament. Written abovt the time of King Edgar (700 yeares agoe) by Ælfricvs Abbas, thought to be the same that was afterwards Archbishop of Canterbvrie. Whereby appeares what was the Canon of holy Scripture then receiued, and that the Church of England had it so along agoe in her mother-tongue. Now first pvlshed in print with English of our times by WILLIAM L'ISLE of Wilbvrgham, Esquier for the King's bodie: the originall remaining still to be seene at Sir Robert Cotton's Librarie, at the end of his lesser Copie of the Saxon Pentatevch. And herevnto is added ovt of the Homilies and Epistles of the fore-said Ælfricvs, a second edition of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie, &c. touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of the LORD*, here publicly preached and receiued in the Saxon's time, &c. London, printed by John Haviland for Henrie Seile, dwelling in Paul's Church-yard, at the signe of the Tyger's head, 1623, small 4to. *The Dedication, Preface, &c. contain 30 leaves, the paragraphs numbered, but not the pages; then follow 43 leaves of the Treatise of the Old and New Testament, Saxon on the left, and English on the right-hand page. The first 12 leaves are without numbers, 13 is placed at the head of the Saxon on the left, and also at the head of the English on the right page, the same numeral serving for two pages. The Testimony of Antiquity, &c. has 9 leaves of Preface, &c., 14 leaves with double numerals, of 'A Sermon of the Paschall Lambe, &c.:' then follow 11 leaves unpagged, containing the words of Elfrike Abbot, and the Lord's Prayer, Creed and X Commandments, in Saxon, with an interlinear English version, 30 + 43 + 9 + 14 + 11 = 107 leaves, or 214 pages.* —[1640.] **PSALMS.** 5. Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum Vetus, à Johanne Spelmanno, D. Hen. fil. editum, 4to. Londini, 1640, 1l. 1s.—*Libri Psalmorum versio antiqua Latini; cum paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica, partim soluta oratione, partim metricè composita, nunc primum e cod. MSS. in Bibl. Regia Parisiensi adservato, descripsit et edidit Benjamin Thorpe, S.A.S. Soc. Lit. Isl. Hafn. Soc. Hon. 8vo. Ovonii, 1835.* —[1644.] **BEDE.** 6. Bedæ Venerabilis Historia Ecclesiastica Anglorum, Anglo-Saxonice ex versione Ælfredi Magni Gentis et Latinè, accessère Chronologia Saxonica (*The Saxon Chronicle*, see 9.) et Leges Anglo-Saxonice cum interpreta-

tionē Latinā, curā Abrahami Wheloci, fol. Cantabrigiæ, 1644. *A much improved and splendid edition was published with the following title :* “ Bede Historia Ecclesiastica, Latinè et Saxonice ; una cum reliquis ejus operibus Historicis Latinè, curā et studio Johannis Smith, S.T.P. fol. Cantabrigiæ 1722, pp. 823, 2l. 16s.—[1655.] CÆDMON. 7. Cædmonis Monachi Paraphrasis Poetica Genesios ac præcipuarum sacræ paginæ historiarum, abhinc annos M.LXX. Anglo-Saxonice conscripta, et nunc primùm edita à Francisco Junio, Amst. 1655, pp. 116. 1l.—Cædmon’s Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures, in Anglo-Saxon, with an English translation, notes, and a verbal index, by Benjamin Thorpe, F.S.A. 8vo. London, 1832, pp. 341, 1l. 1s.—[1659.] ÆLFRIC. 8. Ælfrici abbatis Grammatici vulgo dicti Grammatica Latino-Saxonica, &c. Guliel. Somnerus, fol. Oxon. 1659, pp. 52. *This is a Latin Grammar written in Anglo-Saxon for the use of those Saxon youths who were studying Latin. It is appended to Somner’s A.-S. Dictionary, see 22.*—[1692.] CHRONICLE. 9. Chronologica Anglo-Saxonica, curā Abrahami Wheloci fol. Cantabrigiæ, 1644. *Appended to Whelock’s edition of Bede, see Bede, 6.*—Chronicon Saxonicum; seu Annales Rerum in Angliâ præcipue gestarum ad annum MCLIV.; cum indice rerum chronologico. Accedunt regulæ ad investigandas nominum locorum origines; et nominum et virorum in Chronico memoratorum explicatio; Latinè et Anglo-Saxonice, cum notis Edmundi Gibson, 4to. Oxon. 1692, 2l. 8s.—The Saxon Chronicle, with an English translation, and notes, critical and explanatory, and chronological, topographical and glossarial indexes; a short Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon language, by the Rev. James Ingram B.D.; a new Map of England during the Heptarchy, plates of Coins, 4to. 1823, pp. 463, 3l. 13s. 6d. *The Saxon Chronicle has been translated into English, and printed with an improved A.-S. text, carefully accented from MSS. by the late Richard Price, Esq. for the Record Commission. It is not yet published. Miss Gurney printed and circulated privately among her friends, a very useful work entitled ‘A literal Translation of the Saxon Chronicle, 12mo. Norwich, 1819, pp. 324. with 48 pages of Index.*—[1698.] ÆLFRIC’s Bible. 10. Heptateuchus, Liber Job, et Evangelium Nicodemi, Anglo-Saxonice. Historiæ Judith Fragmentum; Dano-Saxonice, edidit nunc primùm ex MSS., Codicibus Edvardus Thwaites, 8vo. Oxon. 1698, pp. 168 + 30 = 198, 1l. 4s. *The first seven books*



of the Bible in Anglo-Saxon.—[1698.] ALFRED'S *Boethius*. 11. Boethii (An. Manl. Sever.) Consolationis Philosophiæ libri V. Anglo-Saxonice redditus ab Ælfredo; ad Apographum Junianum expressos edidit Christophorus Rawlinson, 8vo. Oxon. 1698, 1l. 8s.—King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version of Boethius, de Consolatione Philosophiæ; with an English translation and notes, by J. S. Cardale, 8vo. London, 1829, pp. 425, 1l. 5s.—King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version of the Metres of Boethius, with an English translation and notes, by the Rev. Samuel Fox, M.A. 8vo. London, 1835, pp. 144, 12s.—[1709.] ELSTOB'S *Hom.* 12. An English-Saxon Homily on the Birth-day of St. Gregory, anciently used in the English-Saxon Church, giving an account of the Conversion of the English from Paganism to Christianity; translated into modern English, with Notes, &c. by Elizabeth Elstob, 8vo. London, 1709, pp. Preface, lx. 44 + 10 + 49 = 103, 1l. 4s. *This work is in Anglo-Saxon and English. She also printed some sheets in folio of Anglo-Saxon Homilies, with an English translation. For reasons now unknown the press was stopped. A copy of what was printed is in the British Museum.*—[1773.] ALFRED'S *Oros*. 13. The Anglo-Saxon version from the historian Orosius, by Alfred the Great, together with an English translation from the Anglo-Saxon, (by Daines Barrington), 8vo. London, 1773; Anglo-Saxon, pp. 242, English translation and notes, pp. 259, about 1l. 5s.—ALFRED'S *Will*. 14. Ælfred's Will, in Anglo-Saxon, with a literal and also a free English translation, a Latin version, and notes, (by the Rev. Owen Manning,) royal 4to. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1838, pp. 51, about 7s. The same, reprinted from the Oxford edition of 1788, with a preface and additional notes, (by Mr. Cardale) London, Pickering, Combe, Leicester, 8vo. 1828, pp. 32, price 5s.—[1815.] BEOWULF. 15. De Danorum Rebus Gestis Secul. III. et IV. Poëma Danicum, Dialecto Anglo-Saxonica, ex Bibliotheca Cottoniana Musæi Brittannici edidit versione Latinâ et indicibus, auxit, Grim Johnson Thorkelin, Dr. J. V. &c. 4to. Havniæ, 1815, pp. 299, 14s.—*An analysis of this fine poem, and an English translation of a considerable part of it, has been given by Mr. Turner in his History of the Anglo-Saxons, b. ix. c. 2, vol. iii. p. 280-301. A still more complete analysis is given, with free translations in English verse, and a literal Latin version from a text formed from a careful collation with the MSS. in Conybeare's Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, p. 30-167.*

—*A very neat edition of the Anglo-Saxon text has appeared, entitled 'The Anglo-Saxon Poems of Beowulf; the Traveller's Song, and the Battle of Finnes-burh, edited, together with a Glossary of the more difficult words, and an historical Preface, by John M. Kemble, Esq. M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge,' small 8vo. London, 1833, pp. 259, 13s. A second edition, with an English translation and a complete Glossary, is on the eve of publication.*—[1826.] CONYBEARE'S *Poetry*. 16. Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, by the Rev. John Josias Conybeare, M.A. late Anglo-Saxon Professor, &c. at Oxford, edited by his brother the Rev. W. D. Conybeare, M.A. &c. 8vo. London, 1826, pp. 286, 18s. [1830.] Fox's *Menol.* 17. Menologium, seu Calendarium Poeticum, ex Hickesiano Thesaurο: or, The Poetical Calendar of the Anglo-Saxons, with an English translation and notes, by the Rev. Samuel Fox, M.A. 8vo. London, 1830, pp. 64, 6s.—[1834.] THORPE'S *Analect.* 18. Analecta Anglo-Saxonica. A selection, in prose and verse, from Anglo-Saxon authors of various ages, with a Glossary; designed chiefly as a first book for students, by Benjamin Thorpe, F.S.A. 8vo. London, 1834, pp. 266, 20s. *This work gives specimens of Anglo-Saxon from its purest to its most corrupt state. As some of the specimens have been taken from MSS. and are here printed for the first time, this useful book has properly a place here.*—[1834.] THORPE'S *Apoll.* 19. The Anglo-Saxon version of the story of Apollonius of Tyre, upon which is founded the play of Pericles, attributed to Shakespeare; from a MS. in the library of C.C.C. Cambridge, with a literal translation, &c. by Benjamin Thorpe, F.S.A. 12mo. London, 1834, pp. 92, 6s.—20. A MORE minute account of works printed in the Anglo-Saxon, especially of smaller detached pieces, may be found in p. 134 of Hickes's *Institutiones Grammaticæ Anglo-Saxonicæ*, 4to. Oxoniæ, 1680; and *Wanley's Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon MSS. forming the 3rd vol. of Hickes's Thesaurus*, p. 325. *A short notice of the principal A.-S. MSS. may be found in Hickes's Institutiones, from p. 135 to 176, but a minute account of all the A.-S. MSS. with many very interesting and valuable extracts, will be found in Wanley's Catalogue, which, as the 3rd vol. of Hickes's Thesaurus, has the following title: 'Antiquæ Literaturæ Septentrionalis Liber alter, seu Humphredî Wanleii Librorum Veterum Septentrionalium qui in Angliæ Bibliothecis extant, nec non multorum Veterum Codicum Septentrionalium alibi extantium Catalogus Histori-*

co-Criticus, cum totius Thesauri Linguarum Septentrionalium sex Indicibus, fol. Oxoniæ, 1705.—*An arranged Catalogue of all the extant relics of A.-S. poetry is given in Conybeare's Illustrations of A.-S. Poetry*, p. lxxvi—lxxxvi.

"21. GRAMMARS. 1. Hickes's Institutiones Gram. A.-S. 4to. Oxon. 1689, 2*l*.—2. Hickes's Thesaurus, 3 vols. fol. Oxon. 1705, 12*s*.—3. (Thwaites's) Gram. A.-S. ex Hiccesiano, 8vo. pp. 48, 2*l*.—4. Elstob's (Eliz.) Gram. of English-Saxon tongue, 4to. Lond. 1715, 1*l*.—5. Henley's Gram. of Anglo-Saxon, Lond. 1726, pp. 61, 4*s*.—6. Lye's Gram. Anglo-Saxon, prefixed to Junius's Etymologicum, fol. Oxon. 1743.—7. Manning's Gram. Anglo-Saxon et Mæso-Goth. prefixed to his edition of Lye's A.-S. Dict. 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1772.—8. Rask's Angelsaksish Sproglære, 8vo. Stockholm, 1817, pp. 168; Mr. Thorpe's Translation of ditto, 8vo. Copenhagen, 1830, 15*s*. 6*d*.—9. Sisson's Elements of A.-S. Gram. 12mo. Leeds, 1819, pp. 84, 5*s*.—10. Dr. Jacob Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik, 3 vols. 8vo. Gottingen, 1822, 1826, 1831. *This is a Grammar of all the Germanic languages; it is the 2nd edit.*—11. Bosworth's Elements of A.-S. Gram. 8vo. 1823, pp. 330, 16*s*.—Bosworth's Compendious Gram. of Primitive Eng. or A.-S. 8vo. 1826, pp. 84, 5*s*.—12. Ingram's Short Gram. of A.-S. prefixed to his edition of the Saxon Chronicle, 4to. 1823, pp. 8.—13. Gwilt's Rudiments of A.-S. 8vo. Lond. 1829, pp. 56, 6*s*.

"22. DICTIONARIES. Somner's Dict. Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum, folio, Oxon. 1659, 8*l*.—2. Benson's Vocabularium A.-S. 8vo. Oxon. 1701, 1*l*. 4*s*.—3. Lye's Dictionarium Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum, published by Manning, in 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1772, 7*l*. 17*s*. 6*d*.

"*Works relating to Anglo-Saxon.*—[1650.] 23. CASAU-BONI (Merici) de Linguâ Saxonica et de Linguâ Hebraicâ Commentarius; accesserunt Gulielmi Somneri ad verba vetera Germanica Lipsiana notæ, small 8vo. Londini, 1650, 8*s*. 6*d*.—[1678.] ALFRED's *Life*. 24. Ælfredi Magni Vita, à Joanne Spelman, plates, folio, Oxon. 1678, about 16*s*.—[1709.] Ælfred's *Life*, by Sir John Spelman, Knt. from the original manuscript in the Bodleian Library, with considerable additions, and several historical remarks, by the publisher Thomas Hearne, M. A. small 8vo. Oxford, 1709, about 9*s*.—*Life of Alfred or Alured*, by Robert Powell, 18mo. 1634, about 5*s*.—Ælfredi Regis præfatio ad Pastorale Sancti Gregorii, e Codd. MS. Jun. LIII. *Saxon and Latin. See Asserii Meneven. Ælfredi*, p. 81.—[1722.] Asserii Mene-



vensis Annales Rerum Gestarum Ælfredi Magni, recensuit Franciscus Wise, M.A. small 8vo. Oxon. 1722, about 9s.—Mr. Turner's Hist. of Anglo-Saxons, b. iv. c.—11, and b. v. c. 1—6.—[1708.] WOTTON'S *View*. 25. Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesauri Grammatico-Critici et Archæologici, auctore Georgio Hickesio, Conspectus brevis, cum notis, Gulielmo Wotton, 12mo. 12s.—[1708.] Wotton's Short View of George Hickes's Grammatico-Critical and Archeological Treasury of the Ancient Northern Languages, translated, with notes, by Maurice Shelton, 4to. London, 1737.—[1715.] ELSTOB'S *Saxon Devotion*. 26. Publick Office of daily and nightly devotion for the seven canonical hours of prayer, used in the Anglo-Saxon Church, with a translation and notes, together with the Rev. Dr. George Hickes's Controversial Discourses, by W. Elstob, 1 vol. 8vo, 1705, London, 5s.; the same, 2 vols. 8vo. 16s. 1715-27.—[1726.] GAVELKIND. 27. Somner's (William) Treatise of Gavelkind, both name and thing, showing the True Etymologie and Derivation of the One, the Nature, Antiquity and Original of the Other. To which is added the Life of the Author, by Bishop White Kennett, 4to. London, 1726. 17s.—[1798.] HENSHALL. 28. The Saxon and English Languages reciprocally illustrative of each other; the impracticability of acquiring an accurate knowledge of Saxon Literature through the medium of Latin Phraseology, exemplified in the errors of Hickes, Wilkins, Gibson, and other scholars; and a new mode suggested of radically studying the Saxon and English Languages, by Samuel Henshall, M.A. 4to. London, 1798, pp. 60. 5s.—[1807.] INGRAM. 29. An Inaugural Lecture on the utility of Anglo-Saxon Literature; to which is added the Geography of Europe, by King Alfred, including his account of the Discovery of the North Cape in the 9th century, by the Rev. James Ingram, M.A. 4to. Oxford, 1807, pp. 112. 10s. 6d.—[1807.] HENSHALL. 30. The Etymological Organic Reasoner; with part of the Gothic Gospel of St. Matthew, from the Codex Argenteus (Cent. IV.) and from the Saxon Durham Book (Cent. VIII.), with an English Version, 8vo. 1807. 5s.—[1822.] SILVER. 31. A Lecture on the Study of the Anglo-Saxon, (by the Rev. Thomas Silver, D. D.), 8vo. Oxford, 1822, 3s.—[1830.] 32. MONE'S (Franz Joseph) Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Teutschen Lit. und Sprache, 8vo. Leipzig, 1830, 10s.—[1833.] 33. COLLEN'S (George William) Britannia Saxonica, a Map of Britain during the Octarchy, 4to. London, 1833,

12s.—[1799-1834.] 34. TURNER's (Sharon) History of the Anglo-Saxons; comprising the History of England from the earliest period to the Norman Conquest, 3 vols. 8vo. 5th edit. London, 1834, 2l. 5s.—PALGRAVE's (Sir Francis) Hist. of A.-S. 16mo. Lond. 1831. pp. 391, 5s.—PALGRAVE's Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, 4to. London, 1834, 3l. 3s. *Mr. Turner and Sir F. Palgrave's important works must be carefully read by every A.-S. student. These for History, and Rask and Grimm for Philology, are rich sources of information for those who are interested in the Anglo-Saxon language and literature."*

---

ART. VI.—*Decretum Synodi Nationalis Ecclesiarum Reformatarum Galliae initio Anni 1645, de imputatione primi peccati omnibus Adami posteris, cum Ecclesiarum et Doctorum Protestantium consensu, ex scriptis eorum, ab Andrea Riveto collecto.* (Rivet. Opp. tom. iii.) Rotterdam. folio. 1660.

JOSHUA PLACAEUS, Professor of Theology in the celebrated school at Saumur, published, towards the middle of the seventeenth century, the doctrine, that original sin consists merely in the hereditary corruption of our nature, without any direct imputation of the first sin of Adam to his posterity. The case was brought before the National Synod of the French Reformed Churches, which met at Charenton, near Paris, in 1645. The name of Placaeus was not mentioned, but the doctrine which he taught was examined and condemned. The decree of the Synod was as follows:

‘Whereas a report has been made to the Synod of certain writings, printed and manuscript, by which the nature of original sin is made to consist solely in the hereditary corruption, originally residing in all men, but the imputation of the first sin of Adam is denied; the Synod condemns the aforesaid doctrine, so far as it restricts the nature of original sin to the mere hereditary corruption of Adam's posterity, excluding the imputation of the first sin by which he fell; and, under the penalty of censures of all kinds, forbids all pastors, professors, and others, who may treat this subject, to depart from the common opinion of all Protestant churches, which,

besides corruption, have always acknowledged the aforesaid imputation to the whole posterity of Adam. And (the national synod) commands all synods and classes, in taking steps for the reception of students into the sacred ministry, to require of them subscription to this statute.' (Act. Syn. Char. c. 19. art. 1.)

Placaeus now contended that he was not touched by this decree, because, he said, he did not absolutely deny imputation of every kind, but only that which was immediate and antecedent. He invented a distinction between *mediate* and *immediate* imputation; immediate imputation being that which, in the order of nature, precedes inherent corruption; mediate imputation that which, in the order of nature, is consequent and dependent on corruption.

Placaeus, though an able man and learned theologian, had, at that time, few followers. His doctrine was repudiated by the protestant theologians of the day, with almost unanimous consent. Nevertheless, many treatises were written, to refute this new form of error. And as he claimed some of the earlier divines, and even the reformers, as agreeing with him, Andrew Rivet, the greatest theologian of the age, to show that such pretensions were unfounded, and to vindicate the decree of the synod, which declared that the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity was the doctrine of all the protestant churches, undertook the labour of collecting testimonies from the formulas of churches, and the writings of the most distinguished theologians, on the subject. As these testimonies are highly interesting at the present time, and as the volume which contains them is accessible to few, we propose to lay some of them before our readers, in a literal translation. In making the selection, we shall omit some testimonies, which, however clear and satisfactory as to the question in dispute, have now less interest than they had at first, because the writers are at present little known. The churches or theologians bearing testimony, will be indicated by the titles of the paragraphs.

First Helvetic Confession, 1538.

Since man was made holy by God, and fell into sin by his own fault, he drew with himself into the same ruin the human race, and rendered them obnoxious to the same calamity. And this defilement, which is called original, has so pervaded the whole race, that the child of wrath and enemy of



God can be cured by no help but that of God through Christ.

Latter Helvetic Confession, 1566.

Such as Adam became after the fall, such are all those descended from him; that is to say, they are equally obnoxious to sin, death, and all sorts of calamities.

Confession of Basel.

We acknowledge that man was originally created in the image of God, in righteousness and holiness; but that of his own accord he fell into sin; BY WHICH FALL the whole human race was rendered corrupt, and made obnoxious to condemnation.

Confession of the Bohemians or Waldenses.

The FIRST, the greatest, and most grievous of all sins, was undoubtedly the sin of Adam, which the Apostle calls 'the disobedience;' by which death reigns over all, even over those who did not sin by a transgression of the same kind as that of Adam. The second sin is the sin of our origin, which is innate and hereditary. The virulence of this hereditary pollution, may be ascertained and estimated from its guilt and blameworthiness. (*de reatu et culpa.*)

French Confession.

We believe that the whole offspring of Adam was infected with this contagion which we call original sin; namely, a fault flowing from our propagation, &c. Let it suffice (to observe) that those things with which Adam was endowed, were not given TO HIMSELF ALONE, but to his posterity also.

Articles of the Church of England.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the fault or corruption of the nature of every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil; so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore in every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation; and this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated, &c.

## Old Scottish Confession.

By the transgression of Adam, which is commonly called 'original sin,' the image of God in man is altogether defaced, and he and his posterity are by nature the enemies of God; bond-slaves of Satan, and the servants of sin, and so we, IN HIS PERSON, were despoiled of all those gifts, and fell into all this misery and curse. *These things cannot be said, without imputation. (Haec sine imputatione dici non possunt.*

## Belgic Confession.

We believe, that by the disobedience of Adam, the sin which is called original, is spread and diffused through the whole human race: but original sin is the corruption and hereditary vice of our whole nature, by which infants themselves, in the womb of their mother, are polluted: and which, as some noxious root, germinates every kind of sin in man. (Art. 15.)

## Saxon Confession.

Original sin exists; and on account of the fall of our first parents, and in consequence of the depravation which followed their fall, they that are born are liable to the wrath of God, and deserving eternal damnation, unless remission be obtained through the Mediator. (Art. ii.)

## Augsburg Confession.

The doctrine is, that after the fall of Adam, all men, propagated in a natural way, have original sin. But we understand that *original sin*, (as it is called by the holy fathers, and all the orthodox and pious men of learning in the church,) consists of the guilt in which we are involved by the fall of Adam, and by which we are exposed to the wrath of God and eternal death; and that corruption of human nature propagated from Adam. (Art. ii.)

## Articles of Smalcald, written by Martin Luther.

Here, it must be confessed by us, that Paul in the 5th of the Romans, affirms that sin sprang from one man, Adam, and entered into the world, by whose disobedience all men were made sinners, subjected to death and the devil. This is called original, hereditary, principal, or radical sin.

## Confession of Wittenberg.

We believe and confess that man was by God made just and wise originally, endowed with free will, and adorned

by the Holy Spirit; but afterwards, in consequence of disobedience, was deprived of the Holy Spirit, made the slave of Satan, and rendered obnoxious to corporal, as well as eternal damnation; and this evil not only seized upon Adam, but was propagated to all his posterity.

To these citations we may add, that the theologians who met at Marburg, to endeavour to settle the differences between the Lutherans and Zuinglians, about the presence of Christ in the sacrament, though unable to agree on this point, nevertheless drew up and subscribed a doctrinal confession, one article of which related to original sin, and is as follows: "In the fourth place, we believe that original sin is innate in us, and was propagated to us from Adam; and it is such a sin that it exposes all men to condemnation; so that unless Jesus Christ had interposed for us by his death and life, all men on account of original sin would have been condemned; nor could they have come into the kingdom of God, and to eternal happiness." These articles were subscribed by Luther, Melancthon, Jonas, Osiander, Brentius, Agricola, Œcolampadius, Zuingle, Bucer and Hedio.

Rivet then gives the testimonies and explanations of certain theologians, from different countries, who had subscribed the confessions before cited, beginning with those of Switzerland.

Wolfgang Musculus.

Let no one here allege, that as the universality expressed in the latter clause is restricted to the elect only, when it is said that the free gift came upon all men to justification of life; so in the former clause, when it is said, the condemnation comes upon all men, it may be referred to the reprobate only; for the comparison instituted between Adam and Christ will not admit of it, since according to this the evil propagated from Adam is *IMPUTED* to all those descended from him; and in like manner the good to all those who are justified by Christ. (Loc. Comm. cap. de Electione.)

*Again, more expressly, in his exposition of Rom. v. 12:* "Some expound the words *have sinned* (*ἡμαρτον*) on account of sin are condemned, or virtually are constituted sinners; which, indeed, is true; but there is no reason why you should not understand by it, the actual sin of Adam, in whom all that existed in his loins have sinned. For since we receive from Christ not only this benefit that we should

be virtually justified by his obedience; but this also, that by the very actual obedience of Christ, we obey the Father, as we are Christ's; so we are not only virtually made sinners in Adam, but are condemned for this very sin of Adam. Whence the apostle declares, that by the offence of one, or the *one offence*, judgment came upon all men to condemnation. (Comm. on Romans, ch. 5.)

Peter Viret, Pastor at Lausanne.

God permitted the fall and corruption of the whole human race, and of the whole nature of man, in the man first formed. (Instit. Christ. Dial. 1.)

Amandus Polanus, Professor at Basel.

The parts of original sin are two, "the crime of disobedience, or defection from God, while in the loins of Adam; and the corruption consequent upon the lapse of Adam, in the whole human nature. The fault of disobedience or defection from God while in the loins of Adam," is the first part of original sin, which is iniquity, or a stain from a blot contracted from that first sin, namely a privation of the due honour which should be present, of the nature of a bond obliging to punishment, and binding us in punishment. So that the sin was not that of Adam alone, but also ours, because not only did Adam sin, but we also, as in Adam the root of the whole human race sinned, and transgressed the law. Rom. v. 5, 12, 19. (Syntag. Theol. lib. vi. cap. 3)

Although after the fall, Adam committed other sins, yet none of them are imputed, but only the first, by which corruption and death were spread through all human nature, and were decreed upon us. This Paul teaches, Rom. v. 12. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," where he speaks of sin in the singular number, not of *sins*. So also, in the 16th verse, guilt (judgment) was of *one offence* unto condemnation. And in v. 17, "By one offence, death reigned by one," and in the 18th v. "By one offence guilt, (judgment) came upon all men to condemnation." (ibid.)

Henry Bullinger, Pastor and Professor at Zurich.

Sin is called original, or the sin of our birth, because it comes from our first origin, or is derived from our first parent upon all, by propagation or traduction. It derives its origin from the first formed man, and hence it is termed, the hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature. Moreover,



this evil flowed from our first parents to all their posterity. (Decad. III. Sermon. 10.)

After men became obnoxious to punishment, so far were we from having any power by which we could deliver ourselves, that, by reason of our native and inherent depravity, we rather increase the same. (Comp. Rel. Christ. v. 5.)

Peter Martyr, Professor at Zurich.

After discussing the import of the phrase ἐφ' ᾧ, in the person of Photius, maintaining the Latin interpretation *in whom*, that is, *in Adam all have sinned*, he proceeds to observe, "But I am not disposed keenly to contend for this interpretation, for I admit that ἐφ' ᾧ is a causal particle, so that the sense may be, that death has passed upon all men, *because that all have sinned*. For Chrysostom says, by the fall of Adam, Paul has determined, that other mortals who did not eat of the tree are infected; and as a prudent physician, when about to administer for a particular disease, does not delay in the mere circumstances or sequences, but has recourse to the head and primary cause: thus, *all die because all sinned*. Nor should we in this place take the word *sinned* in such a sense, as would render it inapplicable to infants; but as though he had said, they are held in sin, and are esteemed guilty, (*Rei*) for he was able from explanations given in the Epist. to Hebrews, to declare, 'HOW WE SINNED IN THE FALL OF ADAM;' for there we read, that Levi paid tithes while in the loins of Abraham. By the same reason it may here be understood, that we were contaminated in the loins, in the mass of Adam. (Comm. on Rom. ch. 5.) A little after, he says, '*For as by the disobedience of one man sin entered into the world,*' the apostle declares what sin it was, which by one man entered into the world, and by which death passed upon all men: it was the disobedience of the first man, which he signifies was communicated to all, when he says, 'by it many were constituted sinners.' (ib.)

Original sin is a depravation of the whole nature of man, derived from the fall of our first parents to their posterity by generation; which, unless the benefit of Christ's mediation prevents, will subject all who are born into the world, to infinite evils, and to eternal damnation. (ibid.)

The efficient cause is the sinning will of Adam. When, therefore, he seems to assert that the sin for which we are condemned, is not another's, but our own, he means that the

sin of Adam was not so the sin of another, but that it was ours also; besides he had respect to that error of Peghius, that original sin consists in nothing else but the imputation of Adam's sin; for he did not acknowledge innate depravity, or denied that it partook of the nature of sin. (ibid.)

In the fifth chapter of Romans it is written "*In whom all sinned;*" which refers to Adam: for, these words ἐφ' ᾧ cannot refer to the word sin, for according to the syntax of the Greek language, the pronoun, in that case, must have been in the feminine gender, and the apostle should have said ἐφ' ἧ; the true sense then is that we sinned in the fall of Adam. And we have the same mode of speaking, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, where he declares that Levi paid tithes, while yet in the loins of Abraham, who, according to the genealogy, was the fourth from him in the line of descent. Now, as it is said, that while in the loins of Abraham, he paid tithes to Melchisedek; by the same reason all men were contained in Adam, when he sinned, &c. (Comm. on 1 Cor. ch. 15.)

Stephen Fabritius of Berne.

Since Adam representatively bore the person of the whole human race, whatever of good or evil he received of God, he received for himself and for others. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Besides, when Adam sinned, his posterity were in his loins, and to be propagated from him by the laws of nature, and thus they inherit guilt from him. Heb. vii. 9. (Concion. in Psalm 51.)

John Wollebius, Professor at Basel.

The proximate cause of original sin is the guilt of the first sin, in regard to which the punishment of God is most just; namely, a part of that death which God threatened to man.

Although the soul of man is immediately breathed into us by God; yet united to the body it is truly guilty of the first sin which is imputed to the whole man, and so it is infected with that original stain. (Christ. Theol. lib. 1. cap. 10.)

John Calvin.

Although Calvin dwells chiefly on the description and proof of the natural corruption of all men, he shows also that this was the punishment of the first sin. "After the divine image was obliterated, he did not bear this punishment alone; as in the place of wisdom, virtue, sanctity, truth, justice, (in which

ornaments he had been clothed,) the basest plagues succeeded, blindness, impotency, impurity, &c. but he also involved and immersed his posterity in the same miseries. This is that hereditary corruption which the ancients called original sin; understanding by the word sin, the depravation of a nature before good and pure. Concerning which thing there was much contention among them, for nothing can be more remote from common sense, than that ALL SHOULD BECOME GUILTY, by THE SIN OF ONE. *That certainly cannot be done without the imputation of that one sin.* (Inst. lib. 2. cap. 1.)

And again, So undoubtedly it must be held, that Adam was not only the progenitor of human nature, but, as it were, the RADIX; and so in his deserved corruption, the race of man was vitiated. (ib. 66.)

The words are not obscure, that by the obedience of Christ many are justified, so by the disobedience of Adam, many were constituted sinners. Therefore, between these two, this is the relation, that the one destroyed us, involving us in his own ruin with himself; the other restores us by his grace to salvation. (ib.)

It is not lawful to interpret otherwise what is said, "that in Adam all die," than that he by sinning brought so great destruction and ruin, not only upon himself, but precipitated our nature also into the same destruction. (ib.)

With this we should be content, that whatever endowments the Lord was pleased to bestow upon human nature, were deposited with Adam, so that when he lost what he had received, the loss was not his only, but that of us all. (ib.)

Nor did it happen merely in a natural way, that all should fall by the sin of one parent: the Scriptures openly declare, that all men were bound over to eternal death, in the person of this one man. (lib. 3. cap. 23. sect. 7.)

Adam, the common father of all, by his rebellion, alienated himself from God; and the fountain of life and all good being forsaken, he rendered himself obnoxious to all miseries. Whence it comes to pass that every one of us is born infected with original sin, and from the very womb of our mother, we are under the curse of God, and condemned not only on account of the crime of another, but on account of the depravity which is then within us, though it does not yet appear. (Confession of Faith.)

In regard to man, we perceive in passing over the Scrip-

tures, that the thing is thus, that the whole human race has become corrupt by the fall of Adam, so that we have all become obnoxious to destruction and damnation, not only because Adam himself sinned, but because we ourselves are sinners from the womb. (Confession of the French Churches submitted to the Diet at Frankfort.)

But if it is proposed by you to subject God to the laws of nature, will you condemn him for injustice, because for the sin of one man we are all held implicated in the guilt of eternal death? One sinned; all are led to punishment; nor is that all, but from the sin of this one, all have contracted contagion; so that they are born corrupt, and infected with a death-bringing pollution. (Reply to one of his Calumniators.)

It should be remarked how God, in the person of Adam, created the whole human race, after his own image: so Adam, by sin, was not only despoiled of the gifts conferred, but was banished from God; and in consequence all his posterity. How was this? because according to the will of God, we were all included in his person. (Comm. on Job. ch. 14.)

It is worthy of remark, that there are two differences between Christ and Adam, concerning which the Apostle was silent, not because he thought they might be neglected, but because it did not pertain to his present argument to enumerate them. The first is, that by the sin of Adam we are not condemned BY IMPUTATION ALONE, as though the punishment of another's sin was exacted of us; but we so bear his punishment, because we also are guilty of his fault; for because our nature was vitiated in him, it is with God bound by the guilt of iniquity. Here then we have the two things, *not only the imputation of the first sin; but also our own fault, since our nature is corrupted.* (Comm. on Rom. v. 17.)

Theodore Beza.

Two things should be considered in original sin, namely, guilt and corruption; which although they cannot be separated, yet ought to be distinguished accurately. For as Adam, by the commission of sin, first was made GUILTY of the wrath of God, then as being guilty, he underwent as the punishment of his sin, the corruption of soul and body. So also he transmitted to posterity a nature, in the first place GUILTY, next, corrupted. Concerning the propagation of guilt,



the apostle is properly treating in this passage, in contrast with which the IMPUTATION of the obedience of Christ is set forth. *Hence it follows, that that guilt which precedes corruption, is by the imputation of Adam's disobedience; as the remission of sins, and the abolition of guilt is by the imputation of the obedience of Christ. Nothing can be plainer.* (Note on Rom. v. 12.)

Lambert Danæus Aurelius S. Theol. D. & Professor in the Academy of Geneva, Leyden, &c.

Original sin flows from parents to their children, by the ordination of God, constituting and placing Adam for the whole human species, as he constituted and substituted Christ as the second Adam for all the elect. 'That first sin rendered them GUILTY before God, then the corruption (which followed guilt in Adam,) was transferred into us; on the account of this inhering in us, we are now guilty, as infected with our own depravity—vile, and spotted, and hateful to God, NOT ONLY IN ADAM, or as we are viewed in him as the fountain and root of the human race, but as we are considered in ourselves and from ourselves corrupted.'

Again. The guilt and punishment of the sin of Adam have passed upon all the posterity of Adam and Eve, Christ excepted.

All men, the posterity of Adam, are BY NATURE GUILTY before God, involved in that sin, and are children of wrath. Hence, both in mind and body, we bear the punishment which we before described; for the opinion is false, that punishment alone flowed to us on account of this sin, and not the GUILT and fault, for in that case we should be punished as undeserving; but first the sin, then the punishment, passes over, and is laid upon us. Therefore, by one man sin entered into the world, that is guilt, and that indeed first in order, and by sin, death; and so the penalty, both in soul and body, afterwards pervaded all men also. For in one Adam they sinned, and are constituted guilty before God. But why was this? Because Adam not only was the propagator, but also the fountain and root of the whole human race, from which the pollution and vitiosity descended, as into the branches propagated from this root, not only by imitation, but by the actual communication of the first sin, first of the fault (culpæ,) then of the corruption and vitiosity, both in mind and body.

Original sin then does not consist merely in imitation, nor solely IN IMPUTATION, but in inhesion, propagation, communication and instillation of that corruption and depravity, which Adam had himself contracted. And the same descends to us, and dwells in us. Therefore, when he sinned, Adam instilled his pollution into us all. (*Apologia pro Justif. per imputationem.*)

There are three things which constitute a man guilty before God. 1. The sin flowing from this that we have all sinned in the first man, Rom. v. 12. 2. Corruption which is the punishment of this sin, which fell upon Adam and all his posterity, Heb. ix. 27. 3. The (actual) sins which adult men commit, and which are fruits which this root of corruption brings forth, of which we are guilty before the judgment of God.

Anthony Fay, Pastor and Professor at Geneva.

All sinned in Adam, and by the sin of Adam, death passed on all men, because that sin had passed unto all. We sinned in him sinning; we died in his dying. *Εφ' ὧ* Theodoret takes as a causal particle, as if a reason should be rendered why death has passed upon all. Chrysostom understands *εφ' ὧ* in the same sense, namely, that all had become sinners; but it is better to take the preposition *εφ'* for *ἐν* as in Heb. ix. 10, so that it may be interpreted to relate to Adam, whose sin was common to all, as the penalty or death is common to all. (On Rom. v. 12.)

We believe that the sin of Adam, whilst it was the act of an individual, was common to the whole species, inasmuch as Adam was not made a private person, but was constituted by God the fountain of the whole race. For the human race lying hid in the loins of Adam, was adorned by God with original righteousness and grace; but by the sin of Adam, were despoiled of both. For as a murder perpetrated by the hand, is not imputed to the hand only, but to the whole body, not to Adam alone, who was but a member of the body of men, but to the whole race of men; therefore it is not of another's sin that we are reckoned guilty, but of our own; since in Adam we all eat of the forbidden fruit. (*Enchirid. Theologic. disp. 37. thes. 15—18.*)

A double disease pervaded the whole human race by the sin of Adam. The first is GUILT, by which all men are subjected to eternal death: the other is the corruption of the whole man, and of all his faculties of mind and body: by

reason of which he is neither willing nor able to be subject to the divine law. (Disp. 60. thes. 13.)

John Deodati, Professor and Pastor at Geneva.

This is the general conclusion of the preceding treatise concerning justification by faith, in which the apostle, after briefly repeating what had been said, at the same time declares their foundation, namely, that God out of his own good pleasure had constituted Christ the Head of grace, and fountain of righteousness and life to all his elect; by the imputation of whose righteousness, they return into favour with God, and consequently are sanctified and glorified. For as Adam was constituted the head and root of the whole human race, so that by THE IMPUTATION of his sin to all his posterity, they became obnoxious to the divine curse, are deprived of original righteousness, corrupted in their whole nature, and liable to death. (On Rom. v. 12.)

Benedict Turretin, Pastor and Professor at Geneva.

OUR CONFESSIONS include under original sin, the communion which we have in the first sin, and the loss of original righteousness and purity which we have sustained, and the inherent corruption of the soul. (On Rom. v. 12.)

Chrysostom, who well understood the import of the Greek word (*κατασταθῆσονται*) explains it, by the fault and guilt into which we have fallen in Adam; by this first sin, having become guilty in the judgment of God. (On Rom. v. 18.)

Philip Mornay, Professor at Saumur.

We know whence proceeded the corruption of the human race, namely, from our grievous sin, and the punishment which followed it. We were all in the first man when he sinned. (De Verilat. Relig. Christ. cap. 16, 17.)

Since the whole human race was lost in Adam, and every one in himself, God so loved the world, that he gave the son of his love, as a price of redemption *for the sins of all those whom out of mere grace he gave to believe on him.* (In his Will.)

Francis Junius, Professor at Heidelberg and Leyden.

In the first Adam, the whole species was, by God, naturally deposited; in whom all sinned, and became guilty, and the children of wrath, and of an eternal malediction. (De Pecc. Orig. thes. 4.)

The efficient cause is Adam and Eve, our first parents; for since Adam was constituted by God the instrumental principle in nature, of the whole human race, and indeed a voluntary instrument, it is necessary to suppose that this evil was effected by God, by nature; or by this particular instrument: Not by God, who left the voluntary instrument to pursue his own course, and taught him what was right; not from nature, which is the subject of the voluntary instrument, but does not govern it; then it must proceed from the instrumental principle. (ib. thes. 6.)

God, as in the order of his creation, placed the whole human race in Adam, by nature; so in the dispensation of his righteousness, he said to the whole human race in Adam, *IN WHOM* we have sinned, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die.* (ib. thes. 7.)

They who pronounce that sin to be simply involuntary, are very much deceived, since the same thing may be said to be voluntary and involuntary in different respects, whether you respect its generation, or its constitution; for the whole race was voluntary in sinning in Adam, (although in respect to its particular origin, it was to us involuntary,) in whom we have a common origin, and as it proceeds from the fault of our nature, it is voluntary, though not by a particular act of the will of each individual. (ib. thes. 8.)

Hence it comes to pass, (namely, by the transgression of Adam,) that all of us who are born, bear the stigma and brand of our rebellion; so that before we enjoy the light, we partake of the injury of our origin. For, indeed, we all sinned in him, in whom we *ALL* were *ONE MAN*. (ib. thes. 2.)

Our nature was deprived of the gift of righteousness in Adam; and the nature of Adam having become destitute, makes all persons procreated from it, subject to the same destitution, sinners and unrighteous; and so the personal sin of Adam has passed upon all, who according to nature are personally propagated from him. (ib. thes. 8.)

*Ep' 3* should be interpreted *IN WHOM*, namely, Adam. In this chapter, the apostle openly declares that all have sinned in Adam; that by the fall of one, Adam, many are become dead; that *GUILT* is from one offence to condemnation: by one offence death reigned; by one man—by one offence guilt came upon all men to condemnation—and finally, by the disobedience of one man many were constituted sinners. (de Nat. and Grat. rat. 71.)



Peter Molinæus, Professor at Sedan.

In this argument the declaration of the apostle is most express, where he says, "by one man, &c." Yea, infants he subjects in a peculiar manner to this necessity, saying, "*death reigned over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,*" that is, who had not sinned actually, but only originally. And lest any should refer this to imputation alone, in the 7th chapter he confesses his own proclivity to sinning. (Molinæus denies, indeed, that imputation is ALONE, but acknowledges and proves, that this is joined with corruption, which the Synod also does.) "We," says he, "sinned in Adam, and in him willed this depravation."

"Nor indeed would God impute the sin of Adam to his posterity, unless they had in themselves something which was truly of the nature of sin, and unless they were evil by nature."

It is evident that he acknowledges imputation, with inherent depravity conjoined; but in his ANATOMY of ARMINIANISM, he asserts the doctrine of imputation, professedly, and spends one whole chapter in its defence.

Daniel Chamier, Professor of Theology, at Montauban.

After bringing forward the various opinions of the Papists, he reduces them all to two. First, those of the Catholics, who agree with the Reformed, on this point. 2. Those who acknowledge nothing inherent, which can be called sin. In the first class he places Bellarmine, Peltanus, Delphinus, Alvarius, Vasquez, &c. Against these he alleges nothing which need be made a subject of controversy. He then proceeds to dispute against those who made original sin to consist altogether in the imputation of the first sin; but his arguments do not strike those, such as Bellarmine, who join depravity proceeding from the first man, to the imputation of his sin.

"For Bellarmine," says he, "considers in sin, the act itself, and that which from the act *formally* remains in the soul; and these two things may be distinguished, as heat, and causing heat. In Adam both really existed; in us, not the act of Adam, except by imputation, but the quality from the act really. Wherefore, in the first sense, original sin is the first transgression of Adam, committed by him, as representing the whole human race, in whom all sinned. But in

the second sense, it is the destitution of original righteousness, with an habitual aversion to God, and perverseness of will, resulting in a peculiar manner from the actual disobedience of the first parent." (Panstratrae Fam. iii. lib. 1. c. 2. sec. 9.)

"We grant that by the disobedience of Adam all were truly, and in fact rendered unrighteous, by inherent depravity; but that the unrighteousness of Adam was NOT IMPUTED, we declare to be false. On the contrary, we deny that we could be made inherently unrighteous, by one man, *unless the unrighteousness of this one man were imputed to us*. Wherefore it is false THAT THE DISOBEDIENCE OF ADAM WAS NOT IMPUTED TO US." (ib. lib. 21. chap. 2. sec. 9.)

Again, "We grant that the disobedience of Adam, and the obedience of Christ do efficiently and meritoriously constitute us unrighteous and righteous; for this we never denied; for we deny that they could render us righteous or unrighteous, *UNLESS THEY WERE FIRST IMPUTED*, for if not imputed, in no way are they ours; for they are the acts of individuals, and therefore personal. But for personal acts to be common to others, is absurd and contradictory. Therefore, it behoves, that *THEY SHOULD BE IMPUTED*. For this kind of communication is no how inconsistent with the proper personality of acts; it proceeds on an entirely different principle. Therefore the very sin of Adam, I say his own personal disobedience, *MUST BE IMPUTED TO HIS POSTERITY*. And so also, in regard to the obedience of Christ: because the whole human race was considered as in Adam by nature; and because the whole multitude of believers were in Christ, by grace. Hence it comes to pass, that we are not only made sinners by Adam, but are declared to *HAVE SINNED IN HIM*, which is a very different thing."

I say then that it is certain that all men are *really* constituted unrighteous by Adam, and that all believers are *really* constituted righteous by Christ. But I deny that that is the point which the apostle had under consideration; for his inquiry here, is into the grounds of our condemnation and justification; for although he considers *κατ'ἀρχήν* as in Adam, yet not peculiar to him, but pertaining to the whole human race; for the meaning is, then when Adam sinned, the whole human race was condemned, or made *GUILTY* of disobedience to God; whence also this by Augustine was called original sin, the punishment of the first sin; but how could it be punishment, unless that very first sin were imputed?

John Mistrezatius, Pastor of the Church at Paris.

It is necessary that that which is past should become ours by imputation only, but that which resides in another, should be derived to us by inheritance. For as Cardinal Bellarmine very well says, concerning the act of sin committed by Adam: "It is communicated to us in the only way in which a thing past can be, namely, BY IMPUTATION." So the obedience of the Second Adam, as it has been past now more than sixteen hundred years, is communicated to us by imputation. But in regard to his spirit, it flows into us by regeneration, just as the inherent corruption of Adam is derived to us by natural generation. (*Hæc Ille*, p. 37.)

If the doctors of the Roman church agree that the disobedience of Adam is imputed to us, because he was considered the Head of his posterity, with what reason can they deny that the obedience of the Second Adam is imputed to us? But you will say, the corruption of Adam has descended to us really, and inheres in us. So it does; but I say that the imputation of his disobedience precedes, and corruption is derived to us by generation, because we sinned in Adam, as in our Head; God abandoning the posterity of Adam to the corruption of their father, on account of his sin. (*ib.* p. 43.)

Charles Drelincourt, Pastor of the Church at Paris.

As the sin of Adam is imputed to us, because we all sinned in Adam, so, in like manner, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, since in the person of Christ, our Head, we have fulfilled all righteousness. (*On Rom. v. 19.*)

John Scharp Sestus, S. T. Professor.

Original sin is two-fold, imputed and inherent. Imputed sin is the defection of Adam, which imputed to all his posterity, that were in his loins; which sin was actually in Adam, but only in us by imputation. It is imputed to us because we were in Adam, as in our root and stock. (*Theol. Comm. Loc. xi. De Peccato.*)

Again, concerning justification:—

It is objected, that it is absurd to say, that any one can be righteous, with a righteousness without him; for this would be the same as if I should say, that the wall is white by the whiteness which is not its own. To which I answer: In things strictly of a personal nature, no one can be denominated, except the person in whom the thing exists; but in regard

to the righteousness of Christ it is otherwise, because it is not personally peculiar to Christ, but by the covenant of grace, is communicated to all believers; for as the sin of Adam was not personal, but imputed to every individual of the whole human race; so also the righteousness of Christ.

John Dartesius.

By one man, namely Adam, sin entered into the world, by imputation and propagation: therefore, in the same manner the thing takes place with us, in regard to the righteousness of Christ. (*Clavis Predestinationis*, part 1. c. 5.)

John Crayus Occitanus, Pastor.

Adam was a public person, representing the whole of his posterity, and he sinned not only for himself, but for all men descending from him. As the descendants who were yet to descend from Abraham, paid tithes in the person of their father, who afterwards received tithes from their brethren, as the apostle teaches us, Heb. vii. 7—9, so also men, who by natural generation from Adam have their descent, become guilty, and are condemned to undergo punishment, on account of the action of their parent, in whose loins they at the time existed: for his fall was the fall of the whole human race, who in the loss sustained by their first parent, lost all their riches, with which it behoved them to be endowed. "By one offence many were constituted sinners." Rom. v. 19. [From these things the imputation of the first sin may manifestly be inferred.] (On the 10th article of the Confession of the Gallican Church.)

There is no Christian who does not confess that the rebellion of Adam was imputed to his posterity, but if any one can be found bold enough to make such a denial, he will be compelled to acknowledge it from the words of Paul. For truly guilt could not come upon all men to condemnation by one sin, unless by the imputation of that sin. And death could not have reigned over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, unless by the imputation of the sin of our first parent. (On the 18th article of the Confession.)

John Chenet, V. D. M.

Although actually, and in very fact, we did not eat the forbidden fruit, as did Adam, nevertheless we all sinned in Adam, Rom. v. 12. And, as Augustin teaches, Epist. 23. to



Boniface, we consequently contracted from him, an obligation to punishment, since we were one with Adam when he sinned. (Exam. of the Principal art. of Religion, Lib. 11. c. 28.)

Original sin is the imputation of the transgression of Adam, and then a real vitiosity as well of body as mind, which we have received from Adam.

*Quest.* Why do you extend this sin to the imputation of the transgression of Adam?

*Ans.* Because as we are not otherwise reformed and regenerated by the Holy Spirit, but as we are pardoned and justified by the gratuitous imputation of the merit of Christ: so original sin does not consist merely in that depravity which is the opposite of that renovation which is by the Holy Spirit, but also in the imputation of the sin of Adam, which is the opposite to the payment made by Christ, and to his perfect obedience for us, even to the death of the cross. (ib. chap. 21.)

Abraham Colignon, V. D. M.

*Quest.* Why, on account of the sin of Adam, do all his posterity lie in a state of misery?

*Ans.* Because Adam represented the whole human race: for, as the promises of good made to him would not only have been fulfilled to him, but to his posterity, if he had continued in obedience; so in like manner the threatenings of evil came upon them as well as on him. (Institutes of the Principal Articles of Faith, sec. iii.)

Paul Ferrius, Pastor.

All we were in the loins of Adam, and sinned in him, and with him. (Orthodox. Specimina.)

Daniel Tilenus, Prof. Sedan. Disp. xv.

Original sin is that hereditary corruption of human nature, by which all who by natural generation are propagated from Adam, are infected; and so in the loins of this first parent, *they sinned together with him*, and incurred the guilt of both temporal and eternal punishment.

William Whitaker, Doctor and Professor of Theology, in the University of Cambridge.

[Wm. Whitaker wrote a particular tract on Original Sin,

against Stapleton, and other papists; in the first book of which he treats of the first sin of Adam.]

“Although,” says he “that act was of Adam alone, nor could inhere in his posterity, or in Adam himself, yet BY IMPUTATION it is the act of all of us. But does the word IMPUTATION, in this case, give offence? Then hear what LYRA, on the 5th chap. of the Romans says, ‘The sin of Adam is imputed to all descending from him, according to the law of generation; for they are his members, whence this is called *original sin*.’ But if you think that this testimony is out of date, I will refer you to two of the firmest pillars of the Roman Church, Cajetan and Bellarmine. Cajetan, on this passage, says, ‘The punishment of death on account of it, is inflicted on all his posterity; and it is proved that the sin is imputed to him and all his posterity, because the punishment of it is endured by them all.’ (So Bellarmine, Tom. iii. lib. v. c. 17.) ‘Adam alone committed that by his actual volition; but it is communicated to us by generation, in the only way in which it can be transmitted, namely, by imputation.’

Original sin is inherent and native depravity, but the actual and free transgression of Adam is imputed to us. For we should neither be held under the guilt or depravity thence contracted, unless that act by which Adam violated the divine precept was ascribed to us by IMPUTATION. But in regard, that some scholastic theologians place original sin in imputation ALONE; in this they basely and nefariously err.

John Junius, preacher at Delft.

In the sum of the matter, ALL the Reformed churches agree, and teach with unanimous consent, in accordance with the sacred scriptures, and the universal agreement of antiquity; first, that the sin of Adam was not a personal sin, but of the whole human race, inasmuch as they were all included in the loins of Adam, and in Adam, the first parent of us all, and root of the whole human race, they sinned. Secondly, there was transfused a principle contrary to original righteousness, contracted from Adam in the first transient act of his sin, and propagated by means of generation, to all his posterity; so that all men, by nature, are guilty of death, and averse from the love which they owe to God and divine things, and turned or inclined to evil. (Antapologia Posthuma. ch. vii. p. 152.)

G. S. Frisius.

Nor is it merely the IMPUTATION of the sin of another, as if all, on account of the first sin of their parents, were only made obnoxious to death; as if this evil would not have the nature of their own proper sin, unless their consent was added; but it is the real sin of the whole human race, through the fall of Adam, IN WHOM all have sinned, Rom. v. 12. and are all, by nature, under an obligation, from the just judgment of God, to endure the punishment of eternal death.

Again, as from the merit of Christ, a double benefit is decreed to us, the imputation of gratuitous righteousness, and the regeneration of our corrupt nature, so a double evil has been transmitted to us from the sin of Adam, namely, GUILT, on account of the sin committed by him and IN HIM. (Rom. v. 12,) and the depravation of nature, propagated from him to us. The individual person of Adam is not here considered, but the nature common to all his posterity, in respect to which all are propagated from him corrupt, as being members of the one same nature. (*De peccato originali.*)

John G. Vossius.

There are two questions; whether the sin of our first parent was imputed to all their posterity; and how far imputed. The Catholic church has once judged, that that first sin is imputed to all; that is, by the just judgment of God, all its effects are transmitted to all the children of Adam; but these effects were believed to be, that we are born destitute of original righteousness, subject to the necessity of death, and liable to an eternal separation from God. (The above he confirms by many testimonies from the sacred scriptures, and from the ancients.) (*Hist. Pol. Lib. ii. p. 1.*)

J. Laurentius.

The true and genuine exposition of these words is, that all men sinned in Adam, as in their common stock and mass, and so in him and by him. It is altogether a different thing to sin in Adam, and to derive sin from him. And we should carefully distinguish the sin which all committed in Adam, from original sin; namely, as the cause from the effect. For all sinned in Adam, at the time that he sinned by eating the forbidden fruit, as then naturally existing in his loins. This first sin of Adam is the cause of original sin, which is the effect; therefore, it is falsely asserted by Catharinus and Pighius, "That original sin is nothing else but this first sin."

Again, Augustine in his 39th Epist. speaks of both these kinds of sin, but distinguishes them; as also in several parts of his works. (In Epist. ad Rom. C. V. v. 12.)

Nic. Vedelius, Professor of Theology in the University of Franequer.

The reason why God imputes the sin of Adam to his posterity, is his justice, and not mere will, as the Arminians teach.

The imputation of the first sin, is such, that, in fact, the whole posterity of Adam is made liable to eternal condemnation, contrary to what the Arminians hold. (Theod. Disp. 20. Thes. 5 and 6.)

S. Lubbertus, S. Theology, Dr. and Professor at Franequer, and a member of the Synod at Dort.

When Faustus Socinus, the Photinian, that he might invalidate the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, in his work *De Christo Servatore*, Lib. iv. c. 4, had objected to Covetus and others of the orthodox, that we thus conclude, "That as by the crime and disobedience of Adam, men are condemned and dead, because that crime and disobedience were imputed to them; so by the righteousness and obedience of Christ they are absolved and live, because that righteousness and obedience are imputed to them. To which Socinus answered, that it was false that the crime and disobedience of Adam were imputed." At these words, Lubbert wrote in the margin, that we cannot be guilty of the sin of another, unless that sin is imputed to us.

But in his answer, he uses the following arguments: It is agreed between us and our opponent, that we are constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam, and are constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ; the only question is respecting the mode in which this takes place. How are we constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam? and how are we constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ? We say, that in both cases the effect takes place by imputation.

For by the sin of Adam imputed to us, we are constituted guilty. When the apostle says, that all have sinned in Adam, he means, that the sin of Adam, as our head, was imputed to us when we were yet in his loins, and on that account we are reckoned guilty: and at the same time, it is the will of God, that as Adam, by his transgression, was rendered averse to God, that is, corrupt and depraved, so we by the same



transgression imputed to us, as I said, are born averse to God, corrupt and depraved. Therefore the sin of Adam is imputed to us, and that corruption and depravity in which we are born, we call original sin.

When Adam, by his total apostacy from God, became guilty of death, all his posterity were implicated in the same guilt; no otherwise than if they had all sinned against God, by perpetrating the crime of murder.

It is manifest, therefore, that the same guilt is **IMPUTED**; or which is the same thing, the same crime by which **GUILT** was contracted.

John Maccovius, Professor in the University of Franequer, and also a member of the synod of Dort.

It is called original sin, because man derives it from his first origin, and it is imputed, or inherent. The imputed sin of our origin, is the defection, or first transgression of Adam and Eve, committed by eating the forbidden fruit; and afterwards **IMPUTED** to the whole human race, naturally propagated from these two persons. (Loc. Com. Disp. xiv.)

John C. Emdan, of the same University.

Concerning all the posterity of Adam, we affirm, that as well on account of the fall of Adam, as by their own proper sins, they are cast into a state of misery, in this, following the Scriptures, which teach, that the first origin of death was from Adam; so that in truth his posterity are reckoned to have sinned in him, and so, on account of the sin of Adam, which he committed by eating the forbidden fruit, not as if this sin was altogether another's, but as being in some sort their own, they are adjudged to death. (Rom. v. 12.)

Agreeably to the Scriptures it is said, that all who are born of Adam, sinned in his loins, because it was so appointed by God, that that sin which Adam first committed, should not be reckoned only the sin of Adam, but should be **IMPUTED** to his posterity.

The meaning of the Scripture is evident, since it pronounces, that men are constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam, for it clearly teaches, that men are so constituted sinners by the sin of Adam, that according to the divine ordination, sin is imputed to his posterity; and on this account

they are equally reckoned sinners, as if in their own proper person they had committed it. (Idea Theologica.)

Thomas Strackius.

As Martin Becan, the Jesuit, in his book concerning God, says 'That by original sin, these two things are understood: 1. The actual sin of Adam, by which he destroyed himself and the whole human race. 2. Habitual sin, which is contracted by his posterity, from the actual sin of Adam; that is the corruption and vitiosity of human nature; hence that sin is truly described to be an actual defection of the descendants of Adam, who, while in his loins, made a defection from God to the devil. And this corruption or vitiosity of nature, is inflicted on man, by God, as a just judge, on account of the aforesaid defection, by both of which man is rendered miserable, and made obnoxious to eternal damnation, until by Christ he is liberated from that misery. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, v. 12, speaks concerning this first sin. (Vindication of the Catechism of the Palatinate, Quest. VII.)

James Arminius, Professor in the University of Leyden.

Since the condition of the covenant first entered into by God with the first man, was, that if they would remain in his favour and grace, by the observance of this precept, and others, the gifts conferred on him, with the same grace, would be transmitted to his posterity; but if they, (our first parents,) should render themselves unworthy of these blessings, by their disobedience, their posterity also should be destitute of them, and should be obnoxious to the contrary evils: hence it has happened, that all men naturally propagated from them, should be subjected to death, temporal and eternal, and should be destitute of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and of original righteousness: which punishment, the privation of the image of God, is wont to be called original sin. *From these things, the imputation of the sin of our first parents is necessarily inferred; for wherever there is the punishment of sin, there is the imputation of the same.* (Disp. 31. Thes. 9.)

Neustadian admonition of the Professors of the Palatinate.

We acknowledge original sin to be, not only guilt, but the hereditary depravity of human nature, which is repugnant to the law of God, and deserving eternal punishment.

Hieronymus Zanchius, Professor of Theology.

Because the whole human race, which is propagated by natural generation from Adam, were in his loins, hence the precept, with its penalty, was not addressed to the person of Adam alone, but also pertained to the whole human race. Therefore, we believe and confess with the apostle, that in Adam sinning, all men sinned: so that that disobedience was not peculiar to Adam, but was the common [disobedience] of the whole human race; since his guilt has involved all men, naturally descended from his loins, as the apostle Paul, to the Romans hath manifestly taught. And as an antithesis to the disobedience of Adam, he has firmly established the obedience of Christ. For if the obedience of Christ is no less ours by imputation, than Christ's by his own proper action, because we are born again by his incorruptible seed, and from his spirit; it follows, that the disobedience of Adam also is **IMPUTED TO US**, and we are held by his guilt, who have been born from his corrupt seed, who is the father of us all.

That sin which by the first man entered into the world, was not only the privation of original righteousness, and the total corruption of human nature, but also the disobedience of Adam itself, which was not ours in the act, nevertheless, in its fault and guilt, has come upon us by **IMPUTATION**. And by way of explication, he says, We therefore say that that disobedience of Adam, which was not ours in act, yet as to the fault and guilt, became ours **BY IMPUTATION**; since God most justly imputes that sin of Adam, as being the *head*, to us the members. (Treatise on Redemption. Thes. I.)

For this is the reason why all men have sinned in Adam, that is, were made guilty, because Adam first sinned by his own actual disobedience; so we also in him as in our origin, are made guilty; and his sin becomes ours **BY IMPUTATION**. Thus also the apostle expresses it, when he says, "By the disobedience of one, namely, Adam, we are **all constituted sinners**. This is our *ανομία*, the imputation of Adam's sin, which has become ours because we are his members. And this is the principal thing in original sin."

Zachariah Ursinus.

Original sin is the guilt of the whole human race, on account of the fall of our first parents, and the privation of the knowledge of God, &c. Two things are included

in it: the guilt of eternal damnation, on account of the sin of our first parents. 2. The depravation of our whole nature since the fall. Concerning both these, Paul speaks, Rom. v. 12: By one man &c. Some, while they admit that we are guilty in consequence of this first sin, deny that there is in all an innate depravity which deserves damnation and wrath. For they allege, that the concupiscence in which we are born, cannot be of the nature of sin.

Against such, it must be held, first, that the whole human race is guilty of the eternal wrath of God, on account of the disobedience of our first parents; unless they are delivered from this guilt, by the grace of the Mediator.

Secondly, there is in us, besides this guilt, a defect, and inclinations contrary to the law of God, as soon as we are born. These defects and evil inclinations are sins deserving the eternal wrath of God.

Paul clearly teaches, that by one man's disobedience, we were all rendered guilty, and made obnoxious to damnation. And he compares this condemnation of all, on account of the sin of one, to the justification of many, on account of the satisfaction of one. As then, by Christ, there is a two-fold grace, namely, *THE IMPUTATION* of righteousness, and the regeneration or restoration of corrupt nature, so also the evil flowing from the sin of Adam is double; first, *GUILT*, on account of the sin committed by him, and depravity of nature, contracted from him and propagated to us. (*Explic. of the Catechism. Par. I. Quest. 7.*)

George Sohnius, the colleague of Ursinus at Heidelberg.

Original sin, as well in Adam as in his posterity, includes three deadly evils, the demerit, the guilt or liableness to punishment, and the depravity or corruption of nature. All these concur in the parent, and in his posterity, in relation to the first sin, with this difference only, that Adam sinning was the principal agent committing the fault, deserving the guilt, and casting off the image of God, and rendering himself depraved. Of all these do his posterity partake, by *IMPUTATION*, and by generation from a corrupted parent. Then it is in vain disputed by the sophists, whether the demerit, the guilt, or the depravity is contracted by the fall: for all these do actually exist; so that taking the words in a wide sense, you may say, that the fall and disobedience of our first parents, and in them of the whole human race, by which all of them, in like manner, lost the image of God, depraved their



nature, became the enemies of God, and contracted the guilt of temporal and eternal death; unless deliverance and reconciliation should take place by the Son of God, the Mediator.

Again, "All are dead by the offence of one man:" therefore his offence was the offence of all; but theirs by participation and IMPUTATION, otherwise they could not be said to be dead by the offence of one, but by many offences.

Although it is truly said that the first sin was committed by Adam; yet not as a single person, but as the father of the whole human race; however it is not correct to say that original sin existed in Adam, or that Adam had original sin, for then the cause and effect, actual and original sin, would be manifestly confounded. The first sin of Adam, therefore, as we said before, must be viewed in a double aspect. In one respect, it was the sin of Adam, and was not original sin, but actual, *originating*, that is giving origin to the original sin of his posterity: in another respect it was the sin of his posterity, who were in his loins; so that in mass they committed the same sin, and hence IT IS IMPUTED TO THEM ALL. Thus this our fall pertains to our original sin.

Bellarmino's first proposition is, "*that the first transgression of Adam, which is the transgression of the whole human race, is original sin, if by sin be meant an action.*" This is correct, if it only be added, If sin be taken for an action not of Adam alone, but of his posterity, who, *in mass*, sinned in Adam. For thus this action was ours, pertaining in the first place to our original sin.

We close here our extracts from these witnesses to the doctrine of imputation, as held by the Reformers. The careful reader cannot but be struck by the distinctness and uniformity of their views. At this time, when the doctrine itself is perverted, and the opinions of the Reformers and others shamefully misrepresented, we should be glad to see the whole collection of testimony made by Viret, translated, and published in a volume.

---

ART. VII.—*Moral Machinery Simplified. A Discourse delivered at Andover, Massachusetts, July 4th, 1839.*  
By Parsons Cooke, Pastor of the First Church in Lynn.  
8vo. pp. 40. Andover, William Pearce, 1839.

THIS is a publication small in bulk, but on a very important subject. It is the work of an enlightened and vigorous

mind, and shows that the author has bestowed much unshackled thought on the topic which he undertook to discuss: and although we do not agree with him in every thing, we rejoice that he has made the publication, and we consider the religious public as under obligation to him for the free and able manner in which he has executed his task. We rejoice especially that such a work has come from New England, and from one of her ablest writers and divines, because we believe they have been heretofore slow to receive the doctrine of Mr. Cooke, and because their ecclesiastical order is such, that they have peculiar inducements to employ voluntary associations in carrying on their works of benevolent enterprise.

Mr. Cooke does not declare war against *all* voluntary associations. He distinguishes them into two classes. The one class he calls *benevolent societies*; and the other he denominates *public opinion societies*. The former he considers as approvable and safe; the latter he condemns, as unscriptural, unwise, and mischievous. We concur with him in not proscribing every form of voluntary association. We think they may, in some cases, be made to promote the best interests both of the church and the world. But we should not be quite willing to adopt the precise line of demarcation between those which are safe, and those which are otherwise, which has been drawn by our eloquent author. For example, we are by no means prepared, on the one hand, to denounce all *public opinion societies*. If it should again become desirable, as it was on the approach, and during the continuance of the revolutionary war, for every good citizen to deny himself the use of all imported manufactures, and other foreign luxuries, we can see no good reason why every true patriot should not, in such a case, unite in trying to effect such an impression on the public mind, as to form a "non importation agreement." Or, if the fashion of extravagant expenditure at funerals, or other special occasions, should gain ground in any community, to a very inconvenient and mischievous degree, where would be the harm of forming voluntary associations for effecting a popular agreement to abandon the evil? We have no doubt, indeed, that many "public opinion societies" are deeply injurious to the best interests of the community, and that Mr. Cooke does not go too far in holding them up to public reprobation. But we have quite as little doubt that exigences may arise, in which there is no other method of obviating prevalent evils, either so safe or so

effectual, as by associating, to produce a salutary change in popular feeling and habit.

On the other hand, some of the voluntary societies which Mr. Cooke denominates *benevolent*, and of which he expresses his approbation, we feel constrained entirely to disapprove and oppose. The following short extract will serve to show Mr. Cooke's views of such societies, and will open the way for showing wherein we differ from him.

"I cannot agree with those who wholly exclude the voluntary principle of association in the cause of benevolence. When the object of the association is to feed the hungry, or to supply the spiritual wants of the destitute, and where large outlays are contemplated, requiring the co-operation of large bodies of men, I see no objection to the principle. Some would contend, that in such cases, the funds should be gathered and expended by the constituted authorities of the church. And that those denominations whose theory makes all the individual churches in their communion, but so many subordinate branches of one church, can conduct their benevolent enterprizes more efficiently, and more for their denominational interests, without separate organizations, and under the hand of the constituted authorities of the church, is what we, as Congregationalists, are not interested to affirm or deny. For Congregationalism, making each individual church essentially independent of the rest, and having no constituted authorities above the single church, has no hands to conduct benevolent enterprizes, on a large scale, but what is created by voluntary combination. All our associations larger than a church, united for any purpose, are, by the necessity of the case, voluntary associations. If, for instance, we were to conduct the work of foreign missions, by a society composed of a delegation from all the churches that contribute to the funds, or by such bodies as the General Association of Massachusetts, the work would then not be conducted by ecclesiastical authority. For Congregationalists know no permanent authorities besides a single church, and the great Head of the Church. The General Association is only a voluntary society, disclaiming all authority; and the Consociation admitted by some Congregationalists, is a departure from the principles of Congregationalists, and is but another name for a presbytery. Congregationalism, then, does not admit of our conducting benevolent enterprizes on any other than the voluntary principle."

We thank Mr. Cook for the admission which this paragraph contains; and we hope that those who live a few years longer, will see his acute and powerful mind yielding to the clearness and force of the argument which his own concession furnishes, and declaring in favor of Presbyterianism. It is indeed true that the church can in no way pursue her benevolent enterprizes upon strictly ecclesiastical principles, but by means of the Presbyterian, or some equivalent organization; and there is absolutely no other that is so convenient and efficient. Had the churches of Massachusetts possessed this bond of union and authority, and employed it with fidelity, the growth of Unitarianism within their borders, would have been nipped in the bud, and that state would have been as free from this fatal poison, as her sister, Connecticut, where, as Mr. C. justly remarks, a superior and authoritative power, similar to that of Presbytery, really exists, under another name; and where the authority of consociated churches has been actually and effectually exercised, for expelling the Unitarian views from their ecclesiastical bounds. There never was a form of church government so well adapted to combine freedom with vigour; the most ample consultation of the rights and wishes of the people, with the purity, homogeneousness, order and edification of the whole body; and at the same time, to enable the whole to act with concentrated power and effect, as the Presbyterian. If any should attempt to refute this, by referring us to the troubles which have occasionally arisen in Presbyterian churches; we may effectually stop their mouths, by pointing them to the far worse troubles which have arisen, times without number, in Episcopal churches; and to the still more tremendous schisms, and profligate disorders which disgraced and distracted the monarchical church of Rome, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, to say nothing of other strifes and divisions almost innumerable, both before and after that period.

We have already intimated that we cannot agree with our respected author, in approving voluntary associations for all sorts, even of "benevolent" enterprizes. Some of them we entirely approve, and would recommend with all our hearts. The Bible Society, the Tract Society, the Society for Colonizing, with their own consent, the free children of Africa on their own shores;—all these we approve, and would zealously help forward to the utmost extent of our power. As long as the first named society devotes itself to the



circulation of the Holy Bible "without note or comment;" the *second*, to supplying the whole world with such tracts and bound volumes as it has hitherto sent abroad; and the *third*, to its professed legitimate objects, who can fear them? Does membership in any of these societies, call upon any man to compromit his principles? Does it alter the character of the donation, whether the dollar with which two Bibles are purchased and sent forth, came from the pocket of a sound Calvinist, or a miserable Atheist? The truth is, the more vigorously and successfully these societies prosecute their respective objects, as long as they faithfully adhere to their respective constitutions, the better is it both for the church and the world. It is impossible for them to do any thing but good without deviating from their professed plans of operation.

But other voluntary societies of the "benevolent" class, are not, in our estimation, so unexceptionable. If we understand Mr. Cooke, he would rejoice to see missionary plans and efforts, and the education of pious youth for the gospel ministry, conducted by voluntary societies. In regard to this matter, we are constrained totally to differ from him. We do not, indeed, undertake to legislate for our Congregational brethren. As they have no other possible method of pursuing these important objects, than by resorting to the principle of voluntary association, we cannot, of course, blame them for adopting the best, nay the only means in their power. But, for the Presbyterian Church—nay, so far as we can see, for any church, to commit the work of Christian missions;—the work of organizing churches, and planting ministers; and the work of selecting and training young men for her ministry—to hands without her pale, and irresponsible to her authorities, is, of all mistakes, one of the most egregious and perilous. In fact, we may, with emphatic truth, apply to such societies, the maxim of Archimedes:—Give them but a stand on which to place their lever, and they may heave the world. Allow a body of men out of a church to plant her congregations,—to locate her pastors,—and to select and educate her candidates for the sacred office, and thus, to a great extent, to form their character; and it requires no prophetic discernment to foretel that she must, in a little while, be wholly subjected to their power.

We do not deny that voluntary and irresponsible associations, simply for raising funds to enable the church to carry on her missionary and education plans—but leaving her, in

her own character, and by her own proper officers to execute her own plans, may be both safe and desirable. But when we commit to such hands the delicate and momentous work of selecting, training and sending forth her teachers and rulers themselves, and thus arranging, directly or indirectly, her ecclesiastical affairs, any child may foresee that we are consigning her to probable and not very distant subjugation to these hands, and, of course, to the risk of inevitable ruin.

But while we are compelled thus seriously to differ from Mr. Cooke, in regard to some of his opinions, we hail the appearance of this pamphlet with pleasure. It is seasonable, and, we doubt not, will be useful. It marks an era in the return of the public mind to just views of the subject of which it treats.

When the intelligence, the enterprize, and the public spirit of New England shall receive a happy direction in respect to this matter, we may anticipate that uniformity and tranquillity of feeling throughout our great American family, which will prepare the "watchmen on the walls of Zion," as to all main points, to "see eye to eye;" and enable them, as far as their different circumstances will admit, to co-operate for enlightening and converting the world.

We will only add, that while we think Mr. C. has done well in what he has said in regard to voluntary associations, we are persuaded much remains to be said and learned concerning a subject which the events of the last twenty or thirty years have invested with great importance. Sound principles on this subject, will not, probably, become again popular, but after much experience, much calm discussion, and very gradual approaches. We feel persuaded, however, that when enlightened practical wisdom shall resume her sway in this matter, she will decide, to the satisfaction of every impartial inquirer, that whatever else may be safely managed by voluntary associations, it will ever be unsafe to commit to them the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs; in other words, that every thing bearing on the training and investiture of the Christian ministry, and sending forth the ambassadors of Christ to their hallowed work, can be conducted wisely and safely only by the church herself.

ART. VIII.—*Obligations of the World to the Bible: A Series of Lectures to Young Men.* By Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, in the city of New York. New York, Taylor and Dodd. 1839. pp. 404. 8vo.

It is needless to repeat what was said a few months ago, concerning the respected author of this work, and his former production. The beautiful volume now before us contains matter of even higher quality, more rich in argument and eloquence, and having abundantly greater marks of research. Few subjects of greater importance could be set before American young men; and it was with delight that we heard, while these lectures were in the course of delivery, that the interest was kept up for three months, in assemblies uniformly full and attentive: showing, we think, that the most solid kind of religious discourse may be made permanently attractive, even in our day of hurry and false-zeal.

The Bible is here considered “in its influence upon oral and written language—upon history and literature—upon laws and government—upon civil and religious liberty—upon the social institutions—upon moral science and the moral virtues—upon the holiness which fits men for heaven, and the peculiar spirit and exalted character which prepares them to act well their part on the earth—upon the happiness they enjoy in the present world—upon the agency and power by which these desirable results are secured.” Some of these topics lead the writer into trains of inquiry and argument which are quite recondite, and which evince a marked interest in the connexions of religion with literature and science. This is particularly true of the opening lecture, in which the idea is presented and expanded, that the origin of letters is to be sought among the scenes of Scripture history. Each of these lectures is a separate argument, and we are therefore unable to go into that sort of analysis which is common in Reviews, but must touch here and there on what may strike us, in the hope that we may invite many of our readers to the book itself. The lecture on the literary merit of the Bible, is tasteful and popular. Those upon the relations of the Bible to legislation, liberty, the rights of conscience, and slavery, are interesting in a high degree, and contain many views of the subject which are seldom brought before the religious public. The single argument upon the

Mosaic code displays a close examination of the subject which has been rewarded by rich results, and which will repay every reader for the expense of the volume.

Upon the morality of the Bible, Dr. Spring expresses opinions that strike at the root of many of the heresies of our day: his views are the more welcome, and will be the more influential, as coming from a true son of the ancient divines of New-England.

"Are there not," he asks, "some systems of ethical philosophy which are not found either among pagans, or infidels that are far below the spirit of the Bible? What is the morality, the foundation of which is simply what is useful and expedient; the standard of which is the spirit and maxims of this world; and the motives of which are purely mercenary and selfish? Can that be called morality, which recognizes no immutable distinction between what is right and what is wrong; which has no reference to the obligations of the divine law; and is concerned only with our own interests? Can that be called morality which asks, not what is right, but what is profitable? which enquires not for duty, but for interest, for the opinions of men, for the spirit of the age? Such a morality is most certainly radically defective. It is the morality of the world, not of the Bible. It is a mere external morality. It has no thorough lodgment, no permanent abode in the hidden chambers of the soul. It is a superficial observance. It is what all morality must be, separated from the truth of the Scriptures:—a body without a soul—a whited sepulchre—splendid only in sepulchral magnificence.

"The morality of the Bible is well and intelligibly defined. Its foundation, its standard, its motives are distinctly set before us, and ought not to be misunderstood. Why then is any being in the universe under obligations to be morally virtuous? Why is the Divine Being bound to be holy, unless because holiness is right, and he is capable of perceiving it to be so? And why are intelligent creatures bound to be morally virtuous, unless because they are so made as to be able to perceive, and feel under obligation to approve and practise, moral virtue? 'Be ye *holy*, for I the Lord your God am *holy*.' If the Divine Being were malevolent, or selfish, would that circumstance bind us to be so too? The *moral excellence* of the divine character is a good and sufficient reason why men should be morally excellent. God requires them to be *holy*, because he is *holy*. The character that is right in God, is right in creatures. It is in its own



nature just what it ought to be. The Deity would not be satisfied with himself without possessing such a character; nor would virtuous and holy minds be satisfied with him, if he were not thus perfectly amiable and excellent. God is love; God is truth; God is rectitude; God is mercy; God is justice. There is a wide and immutable difference between such a character and the opposite. The former is right, and the latter is wrong. Nothing can reconcile them. There is not, nor can there be any gradual approximation of them to one another. They are perfect opposites, and so will always remain. It would not be right for God to possess any other character than that which he does possess; and no considerations of profit and loss, no considerations of the probable tendency of any other character, can ever induce him to change, or modify it; nor were it possible to do so, except for the worse. The foundation of moral obligation therefore lies in the immutable difference between what is right and what is wrong, and in the capacity of intelligent beings to perceive that difference. I say in the *capacity* to perceive that difference; for in a fallen creature especially, that difference may not always be perceived, while the obligation to perceive it remains unimpaired. When we look at our own natures, and the natures of our fellow men; when we contemplate the relations we sustain to them and they sustain to us; unless our minds are blinded by wickedness, we cannot help perceiving that all the moral virtues are *right*. They grow out of our mutual relations, and not to practise them is *wrong*. And on this basis the Scriptures place our obligations to moral virtue.

“It has been often asserted that *utility* is the foundation of moral obligation. *Utility to whom? To me?* Then indeed is the securing of my own advantage the great end. And what sort of moral virtue is this? *Utility to the universe?* Then let it be made to appear that throughout the vast empire of God no sinful thought or action was ever indispensable to the highest good. Nothing is more obvious from the Bible than that the reason why God requires moral virtue is, not because it is useful, but because it is right. He is “of purer eyes than to behold iniquity and cannot look on sin.” He could not be bribed to do this for all the universe, ten thousand times told. He requires the duties of morality because they are right, and in conformity with himself. He does not “do evil that good may come.” He never requires men to do what is wrong, even

though he foresees in many instances, that their sinful conduct may be turned to the best account. It is utterly immoral to make *utility* the foundation of moral obligation, and to assign either the direct or indirect tendency of an action to promote happiness, as the reason why it *ought* to be performed. Moral virtue has a nature besides its tendency to happiness. Just as truth differs essentially and immutably from falsehood, just as light differs from darkness, and sweet from bitter, does good differ from evil. No law can confound them; no beneficial tendency of the one, or of the other can alter their nature; but like the nature of the Deity, they will remain forever the same. To make utility the foundation of moral virtue, seems to my mind to tear up all the foundations of moral virtue itself. Virtue is no longer virtue, and vice is no longer vice, if this theory be true. If this theory were true, then, if in view of the divine mind, vice is expedient, it is no longer vice; and if virtue is inexpedient, it is no longer virtue. And what wonder if men should abuse this reasoning, put themselves in the place of God, and decide that to be virtue which promotes their happiness, and that to be vice which promotes their misery? There have been such moral philosophers and they are well described by the apostle as—"men of corrupt minds, supposing that *gain* is godliness." Such a morality were the most changeful and evanescent thing in the world. No matter what its pretensions, it is mere selfishness, and radically hostile to all moral virtue. If virtue is any thing, it is virtue every where and always; and if vice is any thing—any thing but a name, it is vice always and every where. The divine nature is unchanging. It is virtue—the highest virtue; and nothing in the condition of this world, or other worlds—nothing in the divine purposes or government—nothing in time or eternity, can alter its nature. And this is one reason why, when the knowledge of God was lost in the world, there were no longer any just ideas of virtue and moral obligation. How is it possible there should be a sound morality where there is no knowledge of God? There is a chasm in morals which can be supplied only by a just acquaintance with the Deity."

We have given this long extract, because we regard it as a noble avowal of a doctrine in ethics, which it has become the fashion in our schools and colleges to deny and combat; and because we are ready to maintain that none of the heresies, about which we are so ready to contend, are more radical or more poisonous, than that which the youthful Ameri-

can suck in from the pages of Paley, Bentham, Mill, and the Epicurean and Infidel philosophers of the utilitarian school.

Upon the delicate subject of Slavery, it would require us to give the whole of what Dr. Spring says, to represent him fully, and this of course we cannot do. While therefore we caution any captious reader against taking up his opinion of Dr. Spring's tenets from our statements, or from any thing short of a careful perusal of this whole lecture, we think we are safe in making the following report. The author is not the advocate of slavery: "Wherever servitude denies the slave the rights of his moral nature, annihilates his capacity of improvement, crushes intellect that would otherwise brighten and expand, subdues affections that would otherwise be elevated to the spirit of heaven, shuts out the light of truth, and binds body and soul in the chains of ignorance and death," it is denounced by the Bible. But a slavery dissociated from abuses, is nowhere so denounced. In other words Dr. Spring maintains that the relation of domestic slavery, though exceedingly liable to abuse, and though actually abused, in the most dreadful manner, is not in itself inconsistent with the purest morality, or with the claims of the Bible.

There are no portions of this volume which please us more, than when the author, rising above the tracts of mere argumentation, to the height of some great and sacred theme, poises himself in sublime contemplation, and holds us gazing upon awful truth. We could select many passages of this sort, marked by mingled tenderness and solemnity, but especially the latter. This strikes us as pre-eminently the natural vein of our author. In mere reasoning, or brilliancy, or passionate vehemence, or in the mere heaping up of authorities, others may equal or surpass him, but in that presentation of high truths which calms and subdues and awes the soul, stilling the great assembly, like the breathing of solemn music, we know not any one who exceeds Dr. Spring.

In point of external appearance, this volume is highly attractive; the paper, type, and binding, are superior to most of this class of books. One blemish we cannot but mention—its typographical inaccuracy. Such a work, if any one can, deserves careful proof-reading.\*

\* In merely turning over the leaves we observed errors in the following proper names alone, viz: p. 19, Shuckford, and Condillac; 20, Stillingfleet; 48, Sanchoniathon; 52, Rembrandt; 98, Gottingen; 137, Milner; 160, Warburton; 191, Louis Philippe; 232, Great Britain; 261, Malebranche, Berkeley, Reid, Stewart; 322, Armenia; 372, Claude.

*Letters to the Rev. Professor Stuart, comprising Remarks on his Essay on Sin, published in the American Biblical Repository, for April and July 1839.* By Daniel Dana, D. D. minister of the Gospel in Newbury Port, 8vo. pp, 46. Boston, Crocker and Brewster.

THE title of this pamphlet expresses with sufficient clearness, the occasion on which it was written. Professor Stuart had published under his own name, in two successive numbers of the Repository, a long essay on the question, What is Sin? The Professor's answer to this question is, that sin is the voluntary transgression of known law, and consequently there is no "other sin besides actual sin," and that the scriptures do not recognize, and we ought not to use the phraseology of ORIGINAL SIN, either imputed or inherent. As Professor Stuart's sentiments on this subject were generally known, the appearance of this Essay has excited less surprise than regret. It is not that he holds the opinions he here avows, or that, holding them, he should publish them to the world, which has excited surprise; it is the manner in which he has chosen to introduce them to public notice. Mr. Stuart has always been regarded as one of the despisers of authority, in matters of doctrine, as one of the warmest advocates of untrammelled thought and free discussion. People, therefore, opened wide their eyes when they saw him make his appearance demurely dressed in the ancient robes of the orthodox Vitringa. It is not Moses Stuart, so much, (so he would have the public think,) as Campegius Vitringa, who teaches the doctrine of this Essay on the nature of sin. If I am a heretic, so is Vitringa. You cannot strike me without hitting the venerable expounder of Isaiah; not "a new divinity man, but an honest, pious, learned, orthodox Dutchman." Professor Stuart, however, has no right to Vitringa's robes. They do not become him, nor, he them, and the sooner he lays them aside the better.

We believe Mr. Stuart to be incapable of intentional deception. We do not doubt that he honestly believes that he has dealt fairly by his author, and yet it would puzzle any man to find, out of the pages of the Christian Spectator, a more flagrant case of misrepresentation. The very fact that Vitringa had one object in view, and his translator and annotator another, should have put the latter upon his guard against perverting the meaning of his author. Vitringa's object was



to consider the nature of *actual* sin; to show that it was not merely negative. It was then, and to a certain extent, still is a favourite idea with many theologians, that as darkness is the absence of light, cold the absence of heat, so sin may be defined as the absence of holiness. We suspect few persons ever heard the late Dr. James P. Wilson of Philadelphia, preach three consecutive sermons, in which he did not insist on this definition. It is this idea that Vitranga controverts. After the first few sentences his whole exercitation is directed to that point. Read his own account of the matter as given in the analysis of his piece in the index. *Peccati notio quo sensu passim sumatur in Paulinis? Actuale describitur, ejusque variae definitiones examinantur. Involvit rationem legis, subjecti intelligentis liberi, per legem obligabilis. In naturam illius accuratius inquiritur, et an sit merum Nihil? Non est confundendum cum vitiositate. Commissionis natura exponitur. Et Omissionis.* This is an outline of the whole dissertation, and in English would stand thus: "What is the idea of sin every where presented in the writings of Paul? *Actual* sin is described, and various definitions of it are examined. It (i. e. *actual* sin) involves the notion of a law, and of an intelligent and free subject, capable of being bound by law. Its nature (i. e. nature of *actual* sin,) is more accurately inquired into; is it merely negative? The nature of sins of commission is explained, and then of sins of omission."

Thus it appears that a discourse which is professedly upon *actual* sin, as distinguished from original and inherent sin, is partially translated and quoted to prove that the author believed there is no other sin besides *actual* sin! And this is not the worst of it. This perversion is made in the very face of the author's explicit assertion of the contrary doctrine. Vitranga begins by making the usual distinction between inherent and *actual* sin, and then avowedly confines his attention to the latter, and discusses its nature. *Bono morali oppositum est malum morale; tam in habitu, quando vitium quàm in actu, quando peccatum dici solet; etsi Paulus per ἀμαρτίαν peccatum passim in epistola ad Romanos, et alibi, quoque, intelligat peccatum habituale, sive vitium, h. e. habitus vitiosos et damnabiles, ad quorum praescriptum irrogenitus homo actus suos componit.* This is his first sentence: "Moral evil is opposed to moral good; as well as *habit* when it is called vitium, *corruption*, as in act when it is called peccatum, *sin*; though Paul always in the epistle to the

Romans, and elsewhere also, means by ἀμαρτία *sin* peccatum habituale, *inherent sin*, that is, those evil and condemnable dispositions under whose influence the unrenowned man acts." Can any thing be plainer than this? Every man, who has ever read a single latin volume of theology, knows that the word *habitus* has a fixed determinate meaning. It is used in precisely the same sense as that in which Edwards uses the word *principle*, or other writers the word *disposition*. Thus Turretin in describing original sin says, it is not merely the want of original righteousness, but also *injustitiae habitus*. To translate therefore the words *peccatum habituale*, by *habitual sin*, without explanation, is as gross an imposition on an English reader, as could easily be practised. The English phrase means a sin often repeated, whereas the Latin phrase means, sin considered as a principle, distinct from acts. Regeneration is defined by Turretin as *conversio habitualis*. What perfect nonsense it would make to render that phrase by "habitual conversion"! What he means by it is, "Infusio habituum supernaturalium a Spiritu Sancto;" *the infusion of supernatural principles by the Holy Spirit*.\* Incredible as it may appear, Professor Stuart actually seems to understand Vitringa's peccatum habituale as equivalent to *habitual sin*. "The *vitium* which he (Vitringa) defines," he says, "or rather names, appears to be nothing more nor less than the frequently repeated i. e. habitual, desire to sin, which leads to the commission of what he calls *sinful acts*, and which is itself, (in the sense in which it is here understood by him,) forbidden by the law of God." p. 277. And stranger still, in the following page, "If the matter be thoroughly examined according to the whole of his views compared together, nothing will be plainer or more certain, than that his *vitium* is as really a transgression of the divine law, (and of course an *act* of the mind,) as his *peccatum* is." Vitringa says, moral evil may be regarded as *habitus* and as *actus*. The former he calls *vitium*, or peccatum habituale; the other simply peccatum, or peccatum actuale. Here is a formal distinction at the outset of a philosophical dissertation, by one of the greatest men of his age, between sin considered as a principle, and sin considered as an act, and yet they are both the same! his *vitium* is as much an act of the mind as his *peccatum* is!

\* Turretin vol. 2, p. 569.

What makes this perversion the more extraordinary is, that the very next sentence to that in which this distinction is made, begins thus: *Utrumque Joannes definivit ἀνομίαν vitium*, which Mr. Stuart correctly enough translates, "John designates both kinds of sins by the word ἀνομία." What are the two kinds of sins? Why *vitium* (or peccatum habituale,) and *peccatum*. Yet according to Mr. Stuart, they are both the same kind, vitium is as much an act as peccatum is; though the very point of distinction between the two is, that the one is moral evil considered as *habitus*, the other moral evil considered as *actus*.

So far is Vitringa from allowing that all sin consists in acts, that he asserts, *totidem verbis* the very reverse, *NON OMNE PECCATUM EST ACTUS*. He will not allow that even sins of omission should be so called. In the 8th paragraph of chapter xvi. he again distinguishes between peccatum habituale and actuale. The former he describes as *Habitus aliquis, qui malus, peccaminosus, vitiosus dicitur, qui tanquam modus suam habet entitatem in subjecto, cui inest*. That is, "Any principle or disposition, which is called evil, sinful, corrupt, and which as a mode has its being in the subject in which it inheres."

Now when Professor Stuart can persuade us, that these ancient theologians, to whose knees we moderns scarcely reach, could gravely talk of an act inhering in a man as a mode, or of innate acts, or of acts being supernaturally infused, then we shall be ready to believe that *Habitus* and *Actus* are the same thing, and that those theologians held corruption of nature, vitium, or peccatum habituale to be an act. Until he is prepared to do all this, we respectfully hope he may let "the honest, pious, learned Dutchman" alone, and allow the new divinity to stand on its own bottom.

Mr. Stuart does not properly appreciate the responsibility which he assumes in undertaking to present the opinions of a distinguished man, in order to give authority to his own views. He will not even take the trouble to translate correctly. The sentence: *Peccatum in actu quod dicitur, habituali natura et tempore prius, phrasi scripturae rectè quis definiat per παράβασιν τοῦ νόμου*, he renders "Habitual sin, in the order of nature and time, precedes sin in act, which may be scripturally defined παράβασις τοῦ νόμου, or a violation of the divine law." This is as wrong as it possibly could be, for it is the very reverse of what Vitringa says. Instead of saying "Habitual sin, in the order of nature and time, precedes

sin in act," he says just the opposite, "Sin in act, as it is called, in the order of nature and time, precedes habitual sin." This shows with how little attention he read the author whom he attempts to expound. This oversight is the more remarkable, since according to his view of the matter, it makes the statement of Vitringa perfectly absurd. According to him Vitringa's *vitium* or *peccatum habituale* is itself an act, and consequently he makes his author say, Sin in act precedes sin in act. Having gotten the "learned Dutchman" into this absurdity, he endeavours to get him out of it, by saying that in "common parlance" we distinguish between the inclination or desire to sin, and the act itself. Common parlance indeed! What has common parlance to do with a strictly philosophical dissertation, beginning with accurate distinctions, and formal definitions, and which is so abstruse that Professor Stuart does not pretend to understand some of its parts, and doubts whether even Coleridge could be more transcendental.\* Vitringa needs no such lame apology. He is not guilty of the absurdity of saying that the often repeated desires or inclinations of the mind are not acts, or of distinguishing between these desires and acts, since ninety nine hundredths of all actual sin consist in these very desires. His distinction is the common one between sin in principle and sin in act; between inherent corruption and actual transgression. The latter in the order of nature and time preceded the former. Our nature was not originally corrupt; it became corrupt. It was by the transgression of Adam that this *vitium* has pervaded our whole system, and as a *habitus innatus* renders us indisposed to all good and prone to all evil.

In another dissertation, (*Observationes Sacrae Liber iii. cap. 5.*) Vitringa thus states his views on this subject. "Notatur, quod scriptores sacri, et praesertim quidem Paulus Apostolus, vitiositatem, cum qua homo post peccatum nascitur, vocare soleant ἐπιθυμίαν *concupiscentiam*. "It is noted, that the sacred writers, and especially the apostle Paul, call that corruption with which man since the fall is born, ἐπιθυμία *concupiscence*." Such is the first sentence of the heading of the chapter. This *concupiscence* he says, "belongs to human nature since the fall:" *communis humanae naturae*

\* Mr. Stuart says in reference to a long quotation from Poirer, the author whom Vitringa is particularly engaged in answering, that he does not translate it, because he is utterly unable to do so, not understanding what he says, nor whereof he affirms. p. 275.



*post peccatum.* After quoting a few scriptural examples of the use of the word, he adds, *Quod concupiscentia in his testimoniis non tantum proponatur ut peccatum, sed etiam ut fons et origo omnis peccati, ex levissima eorum consideratione clarum est. i. e.* "That concupiscence, in these passages, is not only represented as sin, but as the fountain and origin of all sin, is clear from the slightest consideration of them." This vitiosity or corruption then, according to Vitranga, with which man is born, is not only sin, but the fountain of all sin. Does Mr. Stuart believe that man is born with an act?

We believe that every body who knows Mr. Stuart, loves him; and if he would but confine himself to his proper sphere, every body would admire him. But when, forgetful of the truth *non omnia possumus omnes*, he makes excursions, at one time, into the regions of classical literature, at another, into those of doctrinal or historical theology, where he is entirely out of his latitude, et ubique hospes, he does himself no credit and religion great harm.

We owe Dr. Dana an apology for having allowed our remarks on Mr. Stuart and Vitranga to fill up the space allotted to a notice of his Letters. Criticism, however, is necessarily long, while commendation should be short. If our recommendation has any weight with our readers, we would urge them to read Dr. Dana's Letters. They are what they were meant to be; a testimony courteous and faithful against some of the dangerous positions assumed in Professor Stuart's Essay. We rejoice in all such warnings, for they are greatly needed; and those men who have the interests of evangelical religion at heart, are bound to come out and bear solemn testimony against doctrines which the experience of fifteen hundred years proves to be incompatible with experimental godliness. It is an historical fact, that the opinions respecting original sin, which are now assiduously propagated in this country, have never prevailed in connection with true religion. Individual exceptions have no doubt existed. But it is still true that the church of God has rejected these doctrines. They have been the property of the Pelagians of the times of Augustin, of the Socinians of the time of the Reformation, of the more erroneous of the Remonstrants of the seventeenth century, and of the Rationalists and Unitarians of the present day. We do not say that no good man has ever held these doctrines. This we have no right to say. But of classes of men, we may speak; and

we call upon the advocates of these sentiments to point to any church, or community of Christians, giving scriptural evidence of true religion, in which such doctrines have prevailed. It is a sad sight, therefore, to see good men wandering, in their blindness, from the camp of the friends to that of the enemies of religion. They may retain enough of truth from education and previous experience, to save their souls; but what is to become of those who follow them? "Rev. Sir," said John Wesley to John Taylor, "I esteem you as a person of uncommon sense and learning; but your doctrine I cannot esteem. And some time since I esteemed it my duty to speak my sentiments at large, concerning your doctrine of original sin.....It is a controversy *de re*, if there ever was one in the world. Indeed, concerning a thing of the highest importance; nay, all the things that concern our eternal peace. It is Christianity or Heathenism. For take away the scriptural doctrine of redemption or justification, and that of the new birth, the beginning of sanctification, or, *which amounts to the same thing*, explain them, as you do, suitably to your doctrine of original sin, and what is Christianity better than Heathenism? Wherein (save in rectifying some of our notions,) has the religion of St. Paul any pre-eminence over that of Socrates or Epictetus?"\*

\* Wesley's Works, vol. 2. p. 433.

## QUARTERLY LIST

OF

### NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

---

Report of the Presbyterian Church case. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at the suggestion of James Todd and others vs. Ashbel Green and others. By Samuel Miller Jr. a member of the Philadelphia Bar. Wm. S. Martein. 1839. pp. 596.

This report contains the testimony, and the arguments of counsel, in this important trial, presented, as we believe, with uncommon fidelity and ability. It was a herculean task for a young man, to sit day by day for several weeks in a crowded court room, and write down from the lips of the speakers the mass of matter contained in this closely printed volume of nearly six hundred pages. Mr. Miller deserves the thanks of the church and of the public for the successful accomplishment of his laborious task. This volume is entitled to the greatest confidence. Mr. Miller had an unsullied and honoured name to preserve untarnished, when he pledged himself to impartial fidelity in the exhibition of this case, and we believe he has redeemed his pledge to his own honour and to the satisfaction of all honest and competent judges. The report contains internal evidence of the most pains-taking fidelity. Indeed, we think this effort to attain verbal accuracy, is the source of the greatest defect of the work. Oral discourse differs so much from written; most speakers are so much in the habit of indulging in parentheses, or in involved or protracted sentences, which the tones of the voice render intelligible and even impressive, that the literal report of what they say, must appear unnatural and awkward. A great deal of art and experience are requisite to enable a reporter to retain the spirit and thoughts of an address, and yet so to condense and arrange the several clauses of each sentence, as shall free his report from those attributes of oral discourse, which cannot properly be transferred to writing. The very best parliamentary reports, are very far from being literally accurate. Mr. Miller, however, has erred on the safe side, in adhering so closely to the very words of the several speakers.

It seems rather a hard case, after all this trouble and expense, that Mr. Miller should be obliged to appeal to the courts of justice, for the protection of his copy-



right. There is another Report of this trial published by Mr. McElroy of Philadelphia, which purports to have been taken "by disinterested stenographers," and "compiled and prepared for the press by the Rev. D. W. Lathrop." With regard to this report Mr. Miller states that he is prepared to prove the following, among other equally significant facts: "Very little of Mr. McElroy's book, certainly not one third part, was taken from any stenographical notes whatever. During a considerable part of the trial at Nisi Prius, neither of the stenographers who are said to have reported the case, was present in court taking notes.

"2. His reports of the opening addresses to the jury, by Messrs. Randall and Hubbell, were, though perhaps with permission of both those gentlemen, copied verbatim from mine. The same may be said of a great deal of the documentary and parol testimony, and even of many of the explanatory remarks, which purport to be original. Nearly all the rest of the parol testimony, most of the arguments and opinions on points of evidence, with the whole of Mr. Preston's argument, are also copied from the same, more or less literally, with only such changes, as may have seemed sufficient to evade the laws of copy-right. Even typographical and other errors have been transferred.

"3. The portions mentioned were taken from the Presbyterian, though due notice was given in that paper of the fact that a copy-right had been secured; and partly from the paper book (of evidence printed for the court in Bank,) before spoken of, which was never published, though a careful injunction that no such use should be made of it accompanied each copy."

As parts of Mr. Miller's Report were published in a newspaper not protected by any copy right, and as the title was deposited, (of necessity) in the clerks office before his work was printed; and as the portions alledged to have been taken, were taken not from the volume, but from the newspaper and paper book above mentioned, Judge Hopkinson decided that the case involved grave and novel questions, which could not be determined "on a preliminary inquiry and argument," but must "be left without prejudice to the full and final hearing of the case." As an injunction at this stage would decide all these novel questions in favour of the complainant, Mr. Miller was directed to have the validity of his copy right, under the circumstances, tried at law.

However these legal points may be decided, the morality of the matter remains the same. Supposing the facts to be as above stated, and we believe no one has attempted to dispute them, a large part of a Report which purports to be from notes of stenographers, was unfairly, if not illegally taken from Mr. Miller. We are exceedingly sorry to find the name of a clergyman involved in this business.

**The Teacher Taught.** An Humble Attempt to make the path of the Sunday-School Teacher straight and plain. Written for the American Sunday-School Union, and revised by the Committee of Publication. Philadelphia, 1839. pp. 396. 18mo.

We have in this work a valuable addition to the Helps of Sunday-School Instructors. It is evidently from the pen of a lively and practised writer, and one



who is thoroughly acquainted with the subject. Scarcely any reasonable question can be asked, as to the nature, uses, and history of Sunday Schools; or the way to begin them, and conduct them; or the books and mode of teaching in them, which is not answered in the volume. While there may be some difference of opinion as to some specialties, we strongly recommend the book, as the only full manual for the guidance of the young teacher.

Proposals for publishing, by Subscription, a Complete Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, with an Introduction and Appendices. By Dr. Isaac Nordheimer, Professor of Oriental Languages, in the University of the city of New York, and William W. Turner.

Every student of the English Bible knows the value of an English concordance. It may be said to be indispensable. The student of the Hebrew Scriptures may be assured that a Hebrew concordance, is to him of no less importance. It is one of those books which he can hardly do without, if he intends to examine carefully the word of God for himself. As every scholar must feel this to be true, it is useless to spend time in recommending such a work as that announced in this prospectus. The only question in which subscribers can be interested, is as to competency of the gentlemen who propose to prepare the work here announced. Happily they are not strangers to the literary public. Dr. Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar and Chrestomathy have placed him in the first rank of Hebrew scholars; and Mr. Turner is the accomplished printer under whose care the elegant volumes of his associate have been carried through the press. There is every assurance, therefore, that can be desired, that the work will be skilfully and accurately executed. That the reader may have a better idea of the plan of the proposed concordance, we give the following extract from the prospectus.

"Although the projectors of the present publication do not undervalue the difficulties they will have to surmount, yet, being aware of the daily increasing demand for this most necessary help to the right understanding of the original Scriptures, knowing from experience the strength of their own resources and the means which with the blessing of God they can command for insuring success, and sensible of the great assistance to be derived from the admirable Hebrew Concordance of Dr. Fürst, now publishing in Germany and nearly completed, they have resolved on making the attempt to produce a new Concordance that shall be adapted in all respects to the wants and taste of this age and country. With this view, it is their intention to embody in their work all that is essential in that of Dr. Fürst, and at the same time to render it as convenient for use, and bring it as much within the means of all classes of students as possible, by excluding from their plan every thing that, however valuable and interesting in itself, does not properly fall within the scope of a Concordance. Such, for instance, is the lexicographical portion of Dr. F's. work, which, while it cannot enable the student to dispense with a separate lexicon, renders the Concordance itself both unwieldy and expensive. Besides comparing with the Bible every quotation contained in the work, and rectifying the mistakes, of which there are still not a few, they will also remedy some defects of arrangement which they have discovered, and adopt an improved method of indicating the inflections of words.

"The work will be printed on fine paper in eight parts, forming one royal octavo volume of about 1200 pages, with new Hebrew type prepared expressly for the purpose. The price to subscribers will be \$1.00 a part, payable on delivery

of each, for the seven first parts; the last they will obtain gratis. As soon as five hundred copies shall have been subscribed for, the first part will be put to press; and when the whole work is published, the price will be raised. Address Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway, or the editors, N. Y. University."

Means and Ends, or Self-Training. By the author of Redwood. Hope Leslie, &c. pp. 278. 18mo. Boston, March, Capen, Lyon & Co. 1839.

The Witnessing Church. By the Rev. John Harris, D.D. author of Mammon, &c. Boston. Gould, Kenall & Lincoln. p. 90. 18mo. 1839.

Stories to teach me to think. By T. D. P. Stone, Principal of the Sabbath Seminary for Female Teachers, Andover Institution. pp. 180. 18mo. Boston. J. A. Stearns, 1839.

The School-Boy; or a Guide for Youth to Truth and Duty. By J. S. C. Abbott, p. 180. 18mo. Boston. Crocker & Brewster, 1839.

Selections from German Literature. By B. B. Edward & E. A. Park, Professors in the Theological Seminary, Andover. New York, Gould, Newman & Saxton. 8vo. pp. 472. 1839.

The Philosophy of Mind. By James Douglas, Esq. of Cavers. 1 vol. 8vo. 1839.

The Three Last Things—the Resurrection of the Body, the Day of Judgment, and Final Retribution. By Rev. Joseph Tracy, pp. 104. 18mo. Boston. Crocker & Brewster, 1839.

Truth Made Simple; being the first volume of a System of Theology for Children. By Rev. John Todd of Philadelphia. pp. 424. 18mo. Butler, Northampton. Crocker & Brewster, Boston, 1839.

The approved Pastor; a sermon at the Installation of the Rev. Andrew Goven over the Evangelical Congregational Church, of Rowe, Mass. By Rev. Amariah Chandler, p. 26. 1839.

Scriptural Improvement, or aid to Growth in Grace. By Ray Palmer, Pastor of the 3d Congregational Church in Bath, Me. pp. 239. 12mo. 1839.

The Curse upon the ground a Blessing; a Sermon by the Rev. Samuel Hopkins, Saco, Maine, 1839.

Fret not thyself because of Evil Doers; a Sermon preached on Fast day, April 18, 1839. By Rev. Samuel Hopkins, Saco, Maine, 1839.

Gradations in Algebra, in which the first principles of analysis are inductively explained, illustrated by copious exercises, and made suitable for Primary Schools, by Richard W. Green, A. M., author of Arithmetical Guide, etc. Philadelphia: printed by I. Ashmead & Co. For sale by H. Perkins.

Elements of Geology. By Charles Lyell, F.R.S. Vice President of the Geological Society of London. First American from the first London edition. James Kay, Jr. & Brother.

First Reader—Second do.—Third do.—Fourth do., for the use of Schools. By S. G. Goodrich, Boston. Otis, Broaders & Co.

Sunday Morning Reflections. 12mo. pp. 78. New York, S. Colman, 1829.

Multum in Parvo, or a brief comprehensive English Grammar. By the author of Grammar Simplified. Boston, 1839.